The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1922 No. 2997

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 649
EDITORIALS:
President Harding Addresses M. Clemenceau 652
No Longer Supreme 653
Academicians 653
Even the Klan Has Rights 654
THE BLACK-SHIRT REVOLUTION. By Carleton Beals 655
THESE UNITED STATES—XVIII. IOWA: A MORTGAGED ELDORADO. By Johan J. Smertenko 657
PIERCE BUTLER: FRIEND OF INTOLERANCE. By M. H. Hedges 660
WHO MURDERED THE STATESMEN OF GREECE? By Adamantios Th. Polyzoides 661
JUSTIFIABLE EXECUTIONS. By Petros P. Tatanis 662
THE PROGRESSIVE CONFERENCE: AN ENGLISHMAN'S IMPRESSIONS. By Herbert W. Horwill 663
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 664
CORRESPONDENCE 664
BOOKS:
Is Democracy Recoverable? By Ernest H. Gruening 667
The English Constitution. By Robert Livingston Schuyler 668
Indoor Sports for Intellects. By Carl Van Doren 669
THE NATION'S POETRY PRIZE 669
MUSIC:
A Newspaper Critic. By Pitts Sanborn 670
DRAMA:
Mid-Season Plays. By Ludwig Lewisohn 671
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
Moscow and the Far Eastern Republic 672
The Parting Words of the Japanese 674
A Jewish Manifesto to the Arabs 674
Kiao-chau—Open Port 674

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LEWIS S. GANNETT ERNEST H. GRUENING

ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN

FREDA KIRCHWEY, MANAGING EDITOR JOHN MACY, LITERARY EDITOR

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN A. HOBSON ANATOLE FRANCE H. L. MENCKEN

FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER ROBERT HERRICK

CARL VAN DOREN NORMAN THOMAS

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

THE conference of liberals and progressives called to meet in Washington on December 2 by the People's Legislative Service was an impressive meeting. Not only did it mark the first coming together of labor leaders, the newly elected progressive members of House and Senate, and men who have been fighting the reform battles for years in numerous States, to renew their faith and develop their policies; it displayed a unanimity of purpose and a fighting edge which was heartening in the extreme. No one could attend it and not be convinced that there *was* a great liberal victory in the West last month, just as no one could fail to realize the threadbare state of both old parties. For here were men elected on Republican, Democratic, and Farmer-Labor tickets in various States, who voiced the same sentiments, talked the same language, and pledged mutual support, who reported that their election was due to the same kind of popular uprising in each State and, in part, to the same economic distress and suffering. They were able, upstanding Americans—men, notably Senators Brookhart, Wheeler, and Shipstead, who had fought their way up with no money and little organization to back them, with almost the entire press and the big business influences of their States against them. That they and the others who were there will be a tremendous reinforcement to the progressive bloc now in Congress is beyond dispute, and we believe that they will often force the fighting, despite the obstacles of party machinery and of the party organization of Congress.

WITH admirable strategy the conference put over until March the formulation of a detailed program, contenting itself with a reaffirmation of its faith in progressive policies, thus at once depriving its opponents of the possibility of raising a smoke screen by attacking any one proposal, and effectively checking the White House efforts to steal such further thunder as it can. Meanwhile, there is enough to be done in all conscience in defeating the ship-subsidy and other indefensible legislation. The call for the meeting was meanly attributed by the hostile press to personal ambitions of Senator La Follette; he kept modestly in the background, sharing credit with the People's Legislative Service, an admirable bureau of information for public and for legislators on whose behalf an appeal was made for additional funds which should be generously heeded by liberals the country over. It is an interesting tribute to the success of the meeting that the reactionary press first attacked it because it proposed to start a third-party movement, and then, upon discovering that the purpose was nothing of the kind, declared it to be a failure and unworthy of popular notice because it had not started a third party! The truth is that nothing could have been more heartening to liberals everywhere than this gathering, that it is rich in promise of Congressional solidarity, and was marked by a grim determination not seen in ten years to wrest government from the big-business interests and politicians of the Harding-Daugherty type.

THIS business of executing ministers, generals, and admirals has got to stop. What is going to become of the trade of governing nations and plunging them into war if, when those wars accidentally go wrong, the people up and kill the fellows who so safely, patriotically, and high-mindedly put them into battle? Greece is bad enough. They've not only executed three prime ministers, the commanding general of their defeated army, an admiral, and a professional cabinet minister; they have tried and exiled a prince of the royal blood and they hold the king a prisoner in his castle. But that is as nothing to what has happened in Bulgaria. There the people in a solemn referendum on November 10 voted to have every man who has been a cabinet official since January, 1912, tried for his life by a jury of war-widows and war-mutilated! The charge against the members of three cabinets is that they had "made insufficient diplomatic preparations for the war" [of 1912]. In Turkey, too, there are trembling ex-ministers who are under charges of treason for having taken the Allies' orders. Against barbarism of this sort we urgently protest. We demand a close season for ministers everywhere. We submit that if they choose to go to war and kill a few hundred thousands, it is nobody's business but theirs. Besides, the example is too contagious. Somebody might want to put ex-Secretary Lansing on trial for failing to make

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the proper diplomatic preparations to prevent our little war with Haiti, and others might be so unkind as to wish to try by court-martial our former Attorney General, A. Mitchell Palmer, for his use of the Department of Justice to advance his political fortunes, or for his conduct as Alien Property Custodian, or for his relations to the sale of the chemical patents. It would never do to jeopardize such statesmen.

SERIOUSLY speaking, we cannot believe that justice was done in Greece or is likely to be done in Bulgaria even by a jury composed of those who really know what war costs. Yet the motive behind these developments, the desire to hold ministers responsible when they put their countries into war, is one that we must welcome. It would have been a wonderful thing if the ministers of England, France, Italy, and the United States, as well as of the Central Powers, had been compelled to appear before a critical tribunal after the war to account for their respective actions and to explain their motives and methods in going to war and their efforts to prevent hostilities. Talk of breaking off relations with states like Greece and Bulgaria raises the whole question of the principles underlying diplomatic relations. Here we are, refusing to recognize Mexico and Russia, as we refused to recognize the defunct Chita Republic, and there seem to be doubts about others. England is with us as to Mexico and Russia, has broken off relations with Greece, and threatens to break with Bulgaria. If the Turks kill some of their ex-ministers and continue to behave impolitely at Lausanne, Great Britain will perhaps forego further relations with them. There is one danger about this policy: if too many nations break off relations with each other and still manage to exist without appreciable loss of trade and prestige, some people might be so shortsighted as to believe that the world would be a great deal better off if the custom were extended and a great many more diplomats, not to say all, were abolished.

SOVIET RUSSIA proposes to reduce her army to 200,000 men within a year, and her navy to one-quarter of its 1917 strength—if the other naval Powers and the little Powers upon her western frontier will make corresponding reductions. The delegates from Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland were thunderstruck. Litvinov's sweeping proposals threw consternation into their routine breasts. The amazement of Briand and Balfour when Secretary Hughes proposed naval cuts at Washington was as nothing in comparison. They hemmed and hawed, these delegates; they suggested that the conference first discuss "moral disarmament" and "certain projects of a political character." Russia's admirable program cuts the foundations of the French and Polish claims that their enormous armies are maintained because of fear of the great Red army. And once more Soviet Russia, despised and rejected by the highly moral chancelleries of the West, has led the way and pointed a new path in foreign relations.

THE Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill is dead; long live the next anti-lynching bill! The Republican leaders, whose only interest in the bill was a desire to pacify their Negro constituents, surrendered—as, according to Washington rumor, had been prearranged—to the blustering filibuster of the Southern Democrats. The defeat of the bill is a victory for the reactionary forces of the white South, a victory, in effect, for lynching. Senator Overman of North Carolina stated an absolute falsehood when he declared that "the decent hard-working Negroes of the South enjoy every safeguard of the law." They do not. Nor is it true, as he asserted, that they neither wanted nor needed Federal protective legislation. Yet the campaign for the bill is not wholly lost. The ghastly facts of lynching have been advertised to the American people; the lies about the causes of lynching have been exposed; more people than ever before realize America's national shame. When the colored people make their next effort at self-protection we hope they will not rely again upon the old guard of Republicans but will seek the aid of the progressive group. Senator Borah, who believed against his will that the Dyer bill was unconstitutional, might be willing to lend his aid in discovering an even more satisfactory method of Federal protection.

THERE continue to be encouraging signs of the demobilization of the spirit of intolerance and suppression in regard to personal opinion that prevailed during the war. The most striking example is, of course, the election to the Senate of Dr. Henrik Shipstead, of Minnesota, whose house was repeatedly painted yellow and daubed "pro-German," while his neighbors for many months ostracized him, not because he was pro-German, but because he refused to yield to the war hysteria. The Board of Aldermen of New York has just sat firmly on a proposal sponsored by the noxious National Security League to forbid the display in public places of advertisements in foreign languages unless accompanied by an English translation. The suggestion was not even debated by the Board, but was sent to the lethal chamber by the committee to which it had been referred, with the comment that the war was over. More important still is the pardoning by Governor Small of Illinois of the seventeen Communists recently committed to prison after conviction under the State anti-syndicalism law. This act of courage and justice on the part of Governor Small ought to stimulate similar action elsewhere. In spite of the American Legion and the unspeakable Daugherty—who was richly paid for inducing President Taft to release the criminal Morse—Mr. Harding should pardon unconditionally all the Federal prisoners of opinion.

STATE Governors also should make haste to follow the example of the chief executive of Illinois and free the unfortunate victims of their vicious anti-sedition legislation. Nor is this enough. As the New York *World* argues, every one of these laws (three-fifths of the States have such acts, almost all passed *after the war*) should be repealed. Better still, perhaps, would be to have them judicially declared unconstitutional, which in fact they undoubtedly are. This is not impossible, as the United States Supreme Court has granted a writ of error in the case of Benjamin Gitlow, convicted under the New York act. It is time to bury forever the absurd attempt to punish a man not for what he does but for what he thinks—or what some bigoted zealot thinks he thinks. On the other hand, the canceling of one of Madame Gadski's concerts and the efforts to prevent Commander von Mücke's lectures are discouraging. Von Mücke is one of the most gallant sailors who ever lived; his marvelous exploits took place long before the United States entered the war and were beyond criticism of illegality. He has, it is reported, been cordially received

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in England where they know how to honor a worthy foe and recognize that if he had been in the Allied service he would stand out as a chief naval hero of the war.

THE railroads of the United States are in far worse condition than the public has been allowed to believe. The newly elected Senators brought alarming testimony to the progressive conference of the suffering which is going on in the Northwest in every line of activity because of the lack of cars to move goods and particularly the crops, which in many cases are being thrown away or allowed to rot for lack of housing or transportation. Shippers in the East have recently become aware of this ominous condition, because they, too, find such difficulty in obtaining the cars they need. The railroads are whistling to keep up their courage, but the truth is that they are paying now not only for their stupid handling of the strike but for their failure for years past to buy annually the normal number of cars necessary for their business. The motive power, too, of certain railroads is in extremely bad shape, one of the hardest hit being the Pennsylvania. As a result of all this, conditions in the Northwest are becoming positively catastrophic, and the suffering and distress are so great that public attention will have to be focused upon the embattled farmers and stock raisers of this section and the Government will be compelled to do everything in its power to afford temporary relief. Perhaps it will then occur to Mr. Harding to ask his Attorney General why that worthy official has failed to prosecute the railroads for any one of the hundreds of cases of bad order locomotives run by them contrary to law, as to which he has had detailed evidence from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

ATTORNEY GENERAL DAUGHERTY lowered himself one more peg in the estimation of decent people by his low reply to Mr. Samuel Untermyer and to the Congressmen who have demanded his impeachment. His attack upon the motives of his accusers is in itself enough to discredit him. When men charge an official with failure to prosecute for war frauds and violations of the anti-trust laws it is hardly an adequate reply to say that "this extraordinary proceeding is inspired more by a desire to protect those charged and those who will be charged with violating the law than to aid the Department of Justice in the prosecution of grafters, profiteers, and those who have defrauded the Government during the emergencies of the war" or to suggest that "the sole object and purpose of this proceeding is not to remove him [the Attorney General] from office but it is in the nature avowedly of an attempt to compel the publication and disclosure in advance of the evidence upon which the Government relies and must rely in the investigation and prosecution of cases of the greatest importance to the Government." This is not true, and if it were it would not affect the facts in the case. Mr. Daugherty is acting like a cuttlefish squirting ink to conceal himself. We should like better to see him attempt concealment by retiring to private life.

A PATRIOT has been defined as a man who is willing to sacrifice somebody else's life for his country. Such persons have had great influence in the world since 1914; but that is water over the dam. The important question is whether they are to continue to have equal influence in the future. Recent events in Australia and New Zealand suggest that there, at least, it is going to be difficult to drum up enthusiasm for another war among the working classes—that is, the persons who have to do the fighting. Hard on labor's repudiation in Australia of Premier Hughes's jaunty gesture in offering troops to Great Britain with which to fight the Turks, and upon an election campaign which seems destined to retire him to private life, comes an expression of similar sentiment from New Zealand. There the Labor Party has issued a manifesto against Premier Massey because he promised a contingent of soldiers in the event of war in the Near East, condemning him for pledging the country "to a war without consultation of Parliament and behind the backs of the people who would have to do the paying and the dying." Of course organized labor is only a minority, but its attitude now is in marked contrast to that when it was pouring its life-blood into Gallipoli. Prime ministers should be more cautious in promising other people's lives. Otherwise they may have thrown up to them the query of the small boy whose mother told him she was about to marry a certain Dr. Brown. The boy looked up eagerly: "Does Dr. Brown know it, mother?"

BERLIN is becoming the city of queer strikes. First the coal handlers walked out. That sounds natural. Next went the pawnbrokers—we should like to know the nature of their grievances. Finally came the actors. That has been known elsewhere. But we do not remember having seen anything corresponding to the German reports. Leading ladies and popular ingénues in silks and furs and jewels are picketing the principal playhouses of the city. They have collected a strike fund of 25,000,000 marks in order that needy Thespians may receive an allowance of 1,000 marks, about fifteen cents, a day. The strike is, of course, about wages. The managers agreed to pay the players sixty-five dollars a month during November. This seemed too low. Nor did the players like the idea of having their future salaries estimated on the basis of the moment's value of the mark. They may receive thousands in paper and be able to buy nothing. For some time, as a matter of fact, nearly all German actors have had to have two simultaneous jobs—one for the screen in order to have bread and clothes, one on the stage in order not to let the national theater be destroyed. Under this stress of labor the quality of acting has declined; we hope that, before the strike is over, the slogan will be raised: "One job must pay the player's way."

ALICE MEYNELL, whose death is reported from London, was the most un-Victorian of the Victorians. Her work in letters was slight, frugal, hesitant, but undeviatingly distinguished. By virtue of a high fastidiousness of mind she hit upon a manner of writing and upon the perception, especially in her essays, of an order of truth which were at variance with her official beliefs and the beliefs of the group with which she was publicly allied. George Meredith's early and great praise of her work, her noble and steady befriending of the unhappy Francis Thompson—these things are perhaps better known than either her poems or "The Color of Life." But fragments of her essays, at least, are likely always to be remembered by those who care for glimpses of truth that have unclouded precision, and a wider if very slender fame must continue to belong to the author of the sonnet "Renouncement," which expresses one of the most permanent and poignant of all human experiences with the highest simplicity, eloquence, and truth.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Harding Addresses M. Clemenceau

(An Undelivered But Much-Needed White House Speech)

MY dear M. Clemenceau: It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to the White House. Your trip to this country has gratified millions who admire the independence, courage, and fighting spirit you have displayed in crossing the seas, undaunted by the weight of years, to stand up and tell us exactly how you feel about us and the European situation. I rejoice that everywhere the cheers of multitudes have proved to you how quickly we have forgotten the irritations growing out of the drawing up of the Versailles Treaty and how steadily, despite various differences of opinion, we cling to our ancient friendship with your noble country, which, I believe, nothing can ever shake or shatter. The hospitality you have received in some of our cities would, I am sure, be repeated to you in every town and village not only for yourself, but in honor of your people. Here at the seat of government I welcome you with all of the respect and the genuine regard with which it is possible for the President of the United States to honor an unofficial ambassador.

The very fact that you are an unofficial ambassador gives me the opportunity not only to greet you informally, but to speak to you more directly, more freely, and more frankly than would be the case if it were a matter of formal official relations. I, therefore, embrace this occasion both to comment upon your utterances as they have appeared in the press and to give you a message to carry back to your great and invincible people. To them you will, of course, repeat my assurance of the indissoluble character of the ties that bind us, and you will also, I am sure, be kind enough to say to them that the very frankness with which I shall speak must be the proof of the intensity of that regard and of my desire to serve them and our common interest. That affection compels me to say that, glad as I have been to have you voice your views on this side of the Atlantic, I find myself unable to agree with many of them and am quite unchanged in my opinion that the present policy of France is leading not to the peace and settlement of Europe but to its further unsettlement and to acceleration of the process by which Europe is steadily approaching financial and economic disaster.

Believe me, the motive which leads me to say this is primarily my unswerving love for France. It is a common experience of life, however, that men and women are compelled to address words of warning to some of those whom they hold dearest. In this case I and my countrymen regret the course of French policy because we are convinced that it is not aiding France to obtain the reparations which are rightly hers. On the contrary it is making less and less possible that stability in Central Europe which is absolutely essential if the orderly economic processes are to be carried on through which must be earned the needed sums to pay reparations. I am the more moved to say this because for a couple of weeks past we have been reading in the daily press distressing reports of an impending French march into the Ruhr, to occupy that territory and to cut the Rhineland off from Germany. That, it seems to my Government, would not only not afford added security for reparations, but would so greatly add to the unsettlement of Germany and tend to disintegrate her industrial life as to make her still less able to earn the sums which she is bound in honor to pay, without paying which she can never again hold up her head as a self-respecting member of the society of nations.

For months past my Government has been hoping, not for the report of fresh advances into German territory, no matter what the excuse, but for news of the withdrawal of your garrisons from Germany. It has itself been on the verge of withdrawing the last of its troops because it realizes that every day of their stay there uses up moneys which should be applied to the reconstruction of devastated France. We are strongly of the opinion that the present Allied territorial control on the Rhine is a grave injury to France itself, is totally unnecessary for the purpose of overawing Germany—it has failed to produce additional payments—and is only inflaming public sentiment there. All our observers report to us that the retention of these garrisons not only raises race issues, but makes for future war and inspires even the younger generation with dreams of revenge. In this connection particularly do we regret to read of the assessment of heavy damages against the German cities of Ingolstadt and Passau for attacks upon Allied officers; the practice of fining cities for the acts of citizens was one of the wrongs of Germany in Belgium which was most reprobated by America and the whole civilized world.

Again, the withdrawal of these garrisons would undoubtedly enable France to make a substantial reduction in her present active military establishment, something that would profoundly appeal to the American people. As their spokesman I may tell you that the whole question of a reduction of your indebtedness to us or its remission is gravely complicated by the fact that the military expenditures of France are still, according to the 1922 budget, 266 per cent higher than in 1913. I am well aware of the anxiety, altogether understandable, which exists in France as to her safety, lest the horrors and frightful loss of life which she has twice within fifty years had to endure be repeated, and that you yourself feel it is the duty of this country to make good the promise of its former Executive to guarantee France against further German aggression. But this country did not support this proposal either in its Congress or at the polls. We are, moreover, firmly of the opinion that in this case a genuine effort to cooperate with our former enemies will be of far great avail in achieving permanent peace than will the mailed fist. No country in Europe can show that its possession of a large army and a powerful navy protected it from war.

In conclusion, may I, through you, give the assurance to your Government and your people that this Administration sees in the Treaty of Versailles the gravest menace to the peace of Europe and Asia, and that it holds itself in readiness at any time to take part in a conference which shall tear up this document and draft a new one to be conceived not in hate nor revenge, but with due regard to the economic needs of France in particular, and of Europe as a whole? Until this revision takes place, a revision based upon justice, humanity, and the laws of political economy, it is our firm belief that Europe must continue to gravitate toward that moral, financial, and economic disaster which looms so near.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No Longer Supreme

THE decline—one might almost say the débâcle—of the United States Supreme Court is one of the impressive developments of recent years. Owing not merely to the unpopularity of many recent decisions but to a feeling that they have been out of key with progressive, political and industrial thought—that they have thwarted peaceful evolution—the reverence in which the Supreme Court was once generally held has been steadily waning throughout the present century. It seems to have remained for President Harding, however, to shake the tribunal by making appointments to it of a sort which, if continued, will make it impossible even to respect the personnel of the bench for character or learning. The appointment of Mr. Taft as Chief Justice was the installation of a good-natured standpatter, undistinguished legally and discredited politically, in what is in many ways the most powerful position in the United States. The nomination of Senator Sutherland was worse from the standpoint of motives, because the appointee was obviously a personal friend of Mr. Harding to accommodate whom the Supreme Court was used as a convenient place. There was this to be said of Senator Sutherland, however—he had a reputation as a many-sided lawyer. As much cannot be said of Pierce Butler, for he is not known nationally and his practice has been chiefly in the service of railroads and other corporations in the Northwest. In regard to his intolerance and unjudicial temperament we commented last week, while his case has not been helped in public estimation by Mr. Taft's extraordinary action in going before the Senate Judiciary Committee to intercede in his behalf. There seems to be no excuse for Mr. Butler's nomination unless, as some charge, Mr. Harding is trying to pack the Supreme Court with friends of the railroads in view of the vital questions in regard to them which are expected to come before the tribunal in the next few years.

What makes Mr. Harding's attitude toward the Supreme Court so important is that it seems probable that he will be able to alter the entire complexion of it during his term. In less than two years he has already appointed three of the nine members—as many as Mr. Wilson nominated during his entire two terms. Mr. Harding will have to appoint a fourth member shortly, as Justice Pitney's health is permanently shattered and a bill has already passed the Senate permitting him to retire on a pension although he has not yet reached the seventy-year limit that is necessary under the existing law. Nor is Justice Pitney the only member that the Supreme Court is likely to lose soon. Justice Holmes is eighty-one years of age and in failing health, while Justice McKenna is in his eightieth year.

It is argued that so long as the Supreme Court continues to exercise political functions by making and unmaking legislation it ought to be representative of the various political views in the country—that it ought to contain not merely Republicans and Democrats but also liberals as well as conservatives. This is a reasonable contention, although one that we can hardly expect to realize while human nature is what it is. But it is not too much to demand, and expect, that appointees to the Supreme Court shall have definite judicial qualifications that are recognized in their profession. If the Supreme Court is not to become an object of popular scorn, Mr. Harding must at least pay some attention to the sentiments of the American bar in regard to his appointees. If it is too much to expect him to nominate recognized progressives like Roscoe Pound of Harvard University, Judge Anderson of Boston, or Judge Amidon of North Dakota, he ought at least to consider men of the high judicial type represented by Judge Learned Hand of New York City or Justice Cardozo of the New York State Court of Appeals. Justice Cardozo's appointment was a remarkable instance of a judge virtually selected by his fellows because of sheer professional eminence. A vacancy occurring in the Court of Appeals while Governor Glynn was at the helm in Albany, the other justices united in asking him to appoint Mr. Cardozo. After considering for a time some political possibilities, Governor Glynn eventually made this excellent and unusual appointment.

In any event it is certain that President Harding's course with the Supreme Court will greatly increase the growing sentiment that the tribunal's political powers—that is, its asserted right to declare legislation unconstitutional—be taken from it. The United States is virtually the only country in the world where such power exists—where the legislature is subordinate to the judiciary. This authority was arrogated by Chief Justice Marshall because of what he regarded as the implied powers of the Constitution, and during our early history the theory was backed by public opinion. Sentiment is now veering in the other direction. The American Federation of Labor is demanding a change and Senator La Follette has suggested, as an entering wedge, that Congress by a two-thirds vote be allowed to override any Supreme Court veto of its legislation.

Our highest bench itself, by a series of backward decisions, and President Harding, by a succession of unfortunate appointments, are daily augmenting the demand for a restriction of the power of a tribunal which today is supreme in name but no longer in popular respect.

Academicians

ALL our best writers jeer at the academicians. The pedagogue and scholar—alas that the two are nearly always convertible terms—must by this time be inured to contumely. Perhaps he bears it with a grin; perhaps he bears it with indignation. It is certain that he has, so far, not spoken very articulately in his own defense. At meetings of scholars the matter is either not discussed, or else the scholars seek escape by trying to evade their own characteristic function and calling and merging into the universally respected realms of the practical and the efficient.

One must not be severe on them. The proper defense of learning is a difficult one in America today. Even before the war the holders of notable professorships, especially in the humanities, in history, literature, and philosophy, gained an unfortunate distinction. They defended the obviously outworn, celebrated the shoddy, closed their minds to the living humanities that were being reborn in the world about them. During the war there was here, as elsewhere, scarcely one saving voice among their ranks. Professors of German repudiated Goethe; professors of philosophy suddenly discovered that Kant was a vicious fellow; philologists were almost tempted to rename Grimm's law on the principle which, for some years, turned sauerkraut into Liberty Cabbage.

Today, then, the scholar has no friend. The liberal liter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ati jeer, the really progressive students snicker, the public rests more firmly in its old, inane contempt. It is time for a protest, however gentle, to be raised; it is time for a reconsideration of the matter. Permanent and precious values are at stake. They, like all others, have been contaminated by the world, by ugly passions, by loud prejudices and sordid ambitions. They remain in their essential nature uninvalidated. Merely to sneer at pedagogues and dryasdusts is dangerous; it is dangerous to youth; it is in the last analysis dangerous to those living representatives of the humanities who have done it most.

Not all professors are hundred-percenters, not all professors are academic overlords. There are the academic helots—helots against their will and vision, helots through the weaknesses bred of their very strength. In every seat of learning there are those who love learning, who do pass their lives of poverty and renunciation of the world in study and reflection, who are in truth what they are meant to be, the memory of the race. Where are their fruits? it will be asked. These men are not often highly articulate; their products, "pickled away," in the words of a university wit, in the technical journals, do not make very alluring reading. Between "Babbitt" and the last book of Lytton Strachey it is not easy to become absorbed in a laboriously written article on the Old English Riddles, or variants on the last mystery transcribed in Paris, or an investigation of the relation of the pseudo-Vergilian poems to the style and temper of the poet's authentic works.

It is not easy. But if you closely consider these ill-written and perhaps dull pages, there arises the vision of lives that are austere and not ignoble, that the world has always needed and will always need, lives that are profitable to the salvation of us all. The scholar's study is shabby; his books are many, but there is no pomp of binding or of first editions; his table is in disorder; his papers are stained by the ashes of his pipe; there is a rag rug on the floor and the poor man has to sneak out now and then to "tend" the furnace so that his wife and children do not take cold. And yet, unless his salary is quite too pitifully small, he is usually a very cheerful mortal. Business does not allure him, nor common pleasures. He does not lust after power; he is neither epicure nor aesthete; the glories of this world seem little and remote to him. He loves truth so far as his vision can grasp it; he loves the ripe and permanent things in literature and thought; he seeks to add, however humbly, to the history and understanding of them. Yes, he tends to grow narrow, to love the "Æneid" less and his contribution to Vergilian exegesis more. Well, he is human. He doesn't hustle or boost; he stands by all; he is against the forces of bigness and jazz, against the temptation of mere actuality, immediacy, speed, and glitter. By all means let us scorn as loudly as we please the presidents and deans and glossy masters of the academic mart, and laugh out of countenance, if we can, the fashionable professors who praise seventh-rate uplift literature in the popular magazines. But let us not forget the shabby fellow with grizzled hair and slightly stooping shoulders and slightly reeking pipe who spends his life with things beautiful and worthy of the mind of man, who, even while he is chatting with you, is seeing Chaucer on a summer's day or has just discovered precisely why, one rainy day at Tibur, Horace broke off in the middle of a verse, or is aglow with a new explanation—suggested, by Heaven, in neither Smelfungus nor Oberwellinghausen—of a strangely obscure passage toward the end of "Beowulf."

Even the Klan Has Rights

HYSTERIA about the Ku Klux Klan is just as bad as hysteria about the I.W.W., the Communists, pacifists, pro-Germans, Sinn Feiners, Catholics, Jews, or any other group which finds itself for a time in popular disfavor. Suppression and intimidation are just as bad a method when applied to a really vicious organization like the Ku Klux Klan as when applied to the innocuous groups which have in recent years been victims of mob hysteria. To resort to mob methods to oust the Klan is to adopt its fundamental and most vicious evil. Intolerance when applied to the anti-Catholics, anti-Negroes, and anti-Jews of the Klan is the same disease as when applied to Catholics, Negroes, and Jews by the Klan.

We detest the Klan. It seems to us to be a peculiarly objectionable revival of the narrow-minded, ignorant, and intolerant Know-Nothingism which raged three-quarters of a century ago when the Irish immigration was heaviest. It is cowardly; its members attempt to escape responsibility for their acts by hiding their faces and shrouding their figures. Every time that Klansmen take the law into their own hands and set themselves up in place of the officers of the law as guardians of the morals and patriotism of the land, every time they tar and feather or lynch, drive men out of town, or otherwise resort to violence, there should be the most thorough investigation of responsibility, and the most direct punishment. But there was violence and intolerance in the regions where the Klan is most active before King Kleagles, Imperial Klanvocations, Wizards, Klaliffs, Kligraphs, and the rest of the present-day nonsense were invented. The Klan is more significant as a symptom, as a product of a state of mind, than as a cause.

When Mayor Hylan telegraphed to his police commissioner to "treat this group of racial and religious haters as you would the Reds and bomb-throwers; drive them out of our city as rapidly as you discover them," he spoke with characteristic hyperbole; but when Senator Walsh of Massachusetts, one of the courageous liberals who have stood out for civil liberties in recent years, indorsed a proposal to stamp out the Klan by the methods used to break up the I.W.W. in certain western States we were amazed. Senator Walsh quoted with approval a letter from a former Kansas district attorney, who wrote that "the national officers of the Klan at Atlanta, Georgia, should be indicted along with the local officers in Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, or any other State where an overt act has been committed, just as we indicted Haywood and other national officers of the I.W.W. in Chicago along with the members and officers who had committed overt acts in this State." Apart from the fact that the writer is mistaken in thinking that the I.W.W. were convicted for overt acts in Kansas, he is proposing a most dangerous theory. To indict Mr. Simmons, Emperor of the Klan, for the acts of Oklahoma or Louisiana rowdies who happened also to be Klansmen would only give him an opportunity to pose as an injured martyr. We want no Ku Klux martyrs. There are enough martyrs to the Klan. Let the individuals guilty of crime be punished. There is law enough for that already, and communities which refuse to apply it are little likely to apply new laws. But let us not surrender to the fundamental evil of the Klan. We think its views wrong-headed, but the only way to meet them is by the force of facts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Black-Shirt Revolution

By CARLETON BEALS

Rome, November 1

THE strong state has arrived in Italy. It has been on the road ever since the failure of the factory seizures in September, 1920. The abortive general strike of August 1 of this year served to spur the forces of reaction more quickly down the path of destiny. The internal disruption of the Socialist Party removed the last obstacle. Sunday, October 29, 1922, the strong state arrived with a bang. Its advent has been heralded in Rome by an ever-growing horde of hungry Fascisti armed with canes, table-legs from wrecked labor headquarters, burly tree-roots, rifles, and machine-guns. Its installation has been featured by the sacking of newspaper offices and Wild West shootings.

Our rooms are directly across from the Great Forum whose shattered columns bear mute witness to the futility of human violence—and its apparent inevitability. We are also next door to the Camera del Lavoro for the province of Rome. For three nights bands of marauding Fascisti have stood outside and pumped the magazines of their rifles into the windows, or have recklessly shot at the lights in the adjoining houses. Two nights ago a flower-pot, on the *terrazzo* above us, was struck—sent crashing into the air-shaft. Last night at about nine o'clock, during an interval in this firing, my wife and I, being obliged to go into the city, were shot at without warning as we stepped from the *portone*. Three times this impromptu fusillading has ended with the battering in of the front entrance of the labor headquarters. While the soldiery looked on, papers, furniture, and typewriters were hurled into this narrow street of the White Cross. This evening, even the doors and window-sashes were wrenched loose, until the edifice now stands black and raw, lit by the flickering flames from the wreckage in the cobblestones over which the firemen, with their tiny, red, old-fashioned fire-engine and thin hose, are casually spurting a feeble stream of water.

Similar attacks were made upon every other labor and radical headquarters and upon all the anti-Fascist newspapers, including the Nitti dailies *Epoca* and *Paese*. The furniture and records of the Republican headquarters were burned in the Piazza Colonna across from the new white loggia and beside the pedestal of the triumphal column of Marcus Aurelius with its quaint pictorial spiral. Marcus Aurelius, that noble and well-intentioned persecutor of Christians, were he to look down from his column (where now towers a statue of Paul, a saint of the religion he despised) would doubtless find his suave and gilded philosophy quite in tune with the scene beneath his eyes.

Down the streets still hurtle armed lorries, and every gutter-snipe is abroad with the tricolor, blood-lust in his eye, protected by his black shirt, his orange collar, his skull-and-cross-bones symbol, and his red fez. In the theaters the Fascist anthem is played deliriously, while "black-shirts" climb upon the seats to spy out and maltreat all those who fail to lift their arms in the Fascist salute or to wear the proper smile of joy over the occasion.

But these are the inevitable results of the shiftlessness of a dishonest bureaucracy that has for decades catered to every violent party in order to remain in power, and whose soldiery during the present crisis has watched these acts of vandalism—which have occurred in every corner of Italy—with amused indifference. These are the inevitable results of loosing forty thousand (certainly not a hundred thousand as the press has stated) irresponsible and semi-organized youngsters upon the capital. Fearing to disturb the American myth of a recuperating Europe, our press-agents gloss over these events; if such disorder had happened in a Spanish-speaking country of the New World, we should have instantly landed marines, under the cloak of the Monroe Doctrine, to preserve order. As it is, this violence, which is one piece with that which has been upsetting Italy for three years, but indicates the extensive disintegration that has taken place and the future dangers inherent in the precedent established by the Fascist *colpo di stato*.

Fascism is one pendant of a European tendency toward the destruction of political democracy of which bolshevism is the counterpoise—a tendency that began with the war and which is far from drawing to a close. And yet not too great importance should be attached to Latin revolutions sentimentally cloaked with the symbols of constitutionality. We have learned from Mexican politics that such occurrences bear a striking kinship to American elections. In the first place, in few countries except Italy could a virtual civil war take place without irresistibly sweeping into its vortex the bulk of the population. But in Italy—where neither government nor law have ever been highly esteemed—militant minorities have always determined the swing of the pendulum. Public opinion—to the extent that it exists—is usually registered by piazza demonstration, on the basis of a tradition that runs back to the days of the Roman Republic, the tradition of the *comitium*, the *vox populi*.

And who will venture to say that the Fascist Government does not answer to public opinion, does not represent the Italian people? Now that revolution has happened, everybody is madly, hoarsely Fascist. Even American press agents have not found their conversion difficult. After all, public opinion is a nebulous thing, largely dependent in its immediate manifestations upon the program of the moment. At this moment Fascism may represent the spiritual forces of the Italian nation quite as well as a chamber of jarring Deputies put in power by 40 per cent of the voters numbering in all but one-eighth of the population.

Far more important than the means by which the Fascisti rode into power is their program; and still greater importance attaches to the company they keep. Now that Fascism has completely identified itself with the strong-state idea, the early words of Enrico Corradini, the founder of the nationalism of the pre-war period, become increasingly important, especially as his movement has been swallowed up by Fascism and he has given his unqualified indorsement to Mussolini. Enrico Corradini declared in his striking book, "Il Nazionalismo Italiano," published on the eve of the Great War, that "Italian nationalism is merely the socialism of the Italian nation in the world." His repeated cry has been: Italy is a proletarian country oppressed by the capitalist nations—England, France, and the United States; just as the methods of the working-class are sabotage, strike, and revolution—internal war, so the weapon of Italy must be external war or the preparation for war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In short, it is necessary to recognize two spheres of distribution, one small and one large; the smaller sphere is the nation with its distribution between class and class by means of the struggle of organized classes using the strike and the lockout; the second sphere is the world with its distribution between nation and nation in the international struggle for markets, colonies, navies, and armies.

It should not be forgotten that the Fascist program looks to the annexation of the eastern shores of the Adriatic, that a Fascist party controls Fiume, that strong Fascist elements exist in Dalmatia, and that in Montenegro, now part of the Jugoslav state, independence groups have been formed which are affiliated with the National Fascist Party of Italy. They were represented in today's parade by a squad of tall, dark-skinned, strong-faced marchers in khaki uniforms—strikingly superior in stamina to the Italians. With the advent of a Fascist state, the Adriatic has more than ever become a tinder-box from which may burst at any moment a new international war. Mussolini, in the close of his address in Milan, significantly stressed the importance of Italy's position in the Mediterranean: "I see the great Naples of the future, the true metropolis of this Mediterranean of ours—'the Mediterranean should belong to the Mediterranean peoples'—and I see it, together with Bari . . . and Palermo . . . constituting a powerful triangle of force, of energy, of capacity, and I see Fascism uniting and coordinating all this strength." One may legitimately ask: For what purpose? To satisfy the Fascist claims in the Adriatic, to bottle up Jugoslavia, to fulfil the Fascist dream of a Malta and a Tunis *redente*, of the Dodecanese in Italian hands?

Very probably Mussolini will attempt to restrain his unruly and already disappointed followers; to instil in them a *senso del limite* as he has frequently done in the past; that he will attempt to live up to his statement just made that "Italy needs peace—internal peace and peace with her neighbors." And Poincaré's career in France has shown that jingo bravadura does not jibe with the responsibilities accruing from post-war conditions in Europe. But the dark portent of these imperialistic ambitions of the Fascisti will continue to loom in the background. Another and serious blow has been given to the possibility of creating a united Europe. In part, the Fascist coup is a reaction against the present chaotic state of Continental affairs. But it means that Italy blindly intends to save herself at whatever cost to the world. A strong government in Italy will, of course, serve as a foil against the aggression of France, but militarism will not be discouraged in either nation.

Three paths are now open to Benito Mussolini—open dictatorship, which he has for the time being renounced; a dictatorship masked with constitutional symbols; or a return to a system of representative democracy for which he continues to express his antipathy. More important, victory has not destroyed the antagonistic elements that compose the Fascist movement—the Nationalists and Syndicalists. The real battle in Italy will be between those two groups. It is of undoubted significance that some of the leaders in the factory seizures of 1920 are now taking a live part in Fascist activities. As I pointed out concretely in *The Nation* of October 11, the Fascist labor program opposes class dictatorship and places the industrial needs of the nation before any other consideration. At the same time it advocates more far-reaching and organic concessions to labor than were proposed by the labor leaders in 1920. Writes Pietro Gorgolini, a well-known Fascist:

> Fascism interprets the wishes of the sane majority of the people of the trenches, of sacrifice, of labor, and cannot tolerate the predominance of the conservative bourgeoisie. . . . Only Fascism, with its powerful semi-military organization, can act as a counter-agent to the menacing capitalist insurrection. The other large parties, including Socialism and Popularism, lack the necessary vigor and spirit. . . . It is undeniable that, though Fascism appears in a social and political atmosphere disturbed by contradictory and unstable elements, and in a period of real national unrest—spurious product of the war—nevertheless it has shown itself to possess as its chief characteristic, the appreciation both of the unity of the nation and of the political future of the producing classes. This precise notion of the reality of things, emerging from the profound ethics of Fascism, will permit it to create, in itself and through itself, the great Fascist democracy of labor. . . .

And in the Adriatic Delta district and in southern Sicily, centers of agrarian unrest, the Fascisti have promised the peasants land, have enunciated a program of *frazionamento* looking toward the break-up of the large estates. Before Fascism came into power it had developed a peasant wing; had become a "back-to-the-soil" movement of as great significance as the peasant movements in the Balkans.

How will the new Minister reconcile these claims with those of his bitter and reactionary monarchists? Running over the names in the new Cabinet, I find that the majority of posts reserved for the Fascisti have been given to the most aggressive pro-Nationalists. How will this clique answer the progressive needs of their own nation and of the world in this hour of travail? And this evening as I stirred with my cane among the charred sheets of *Voce Repubblicana* in the Piazza Colonna, I wondered what the *Fasci Repubblicanni di Combattimento*, who comprise a large element in the Fascist movement, are thinking of Signor Mussolini's genuflections before the King at the Quirinal. What will be their policy? The Carthaginian peace has been imposed. But the real war—the war of ideas—has just begun. The Fascist coup has solved no fundamental problem.

Yet on every hand rises, like a paean of liberation, "The New Italy!" "At last, the Third Rome!" One is obliged to admit that the most important idealistic forces existing today in Italy have rallied behind the symbol of the Roman Fascio, the old Roman battle-ax, and that in this outburst is a sincere, an almost lyric desire on the part of the younger generation for a renovation of the national life. Many of the Fascist locals have taken the most severe vows of abstinence from comfort and pleasure much after the fashion of the Young German movement. Yet making this concession, the honest observer cannot but feel a bit of rugged Carducci's disgust, when he said: "Italy has been too much intoxicated with idealism; to me a fair and well-grown cabbage is a much more beautiful thing. . . ."

The press is hailing Benito Mussolini as the great chivalric Cid of Italy. Let us hope that, unlike the splendid Ruy Diaz, he does not trample under foot every dissenter. The makers of this new Italy have little of the generosity of the Spanish knight-errant; they are far indeed from the patient and dynamic faith of Mazzini. Old war-feuds have been reawakened to bitterness; stark passions have been aroused which a simple order of demobilization may check but not stifle. The strong state has arrived in Italy in the way the strong always arrive. For a time its origins may be obscured—by parliamentary indorsement, by fictitious elections, by the chorus of servile journalism; but like every strong state it is the rule of a militant minority. And however strong this state, Italy is still a cockle-shell in the tempestuous sea of Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These United States—XVIII*

IOWA: A Mortgaged Eldorado

By JOHAN J. SMERTENKO

IT is the boast of Iowans that one cannot cross the State's boundaries at any point without realizing that here is a land of plenty as different from its neighbors as the plains of Canaan differed from the fields of Gomorrah. Everywhere within these borders is fecundity, wealth, and solidity. The stranger is at first amazed and eventually bored by the unrelieved regularity of bumper crops, trim wire fences, pure-bred and well-fed live stock, huge barns and silos, smug and freshly painted homes. And if he is surprised at the country, he must indeed marvel at cities and towns which have no slums, no ramshackle outbuildings, and no decaying genteel quarters. Virtually the only signs of the poverty that one habitually associates with urban life are the red, superannuated freight cars which house the Mexican road-builders. Farm and factory, church and dwelling, school and library partake of the heavy, formidable air of prosperity which is Iowa.

Statistics—and Iowa "boosters" revel in statistics—bear out this impression of general well-being. According to the latest United States census report Iowa leads the nation in the value of her horses and hogs, of pure-bred live stock, of farm machinery and farm property per farm; she has the greatest number of poultry, of pure-bred hogs and cattle, of autos per capita—one to 5.5 persons—and of telephones on farms; she excels in the production of eggs, corn, and oats. Her road system, railroad facilities, her dairy products and packing industry are among the first in the country. She has coal, water-power, and lead mines, foundries and lumber mills; she produces enormous quantities of cereals and canned goods, cement and bricks. In short, Iowa is self-sufficient in most of the necessaries of life and is creditor of all other States in many of them.

Still, today the farmer groans. When he is articulate, he reviles the railroads, the bankers, the commission merchants, and all the other agents that stand between him and the consumer. He seems to be the only Iowan who is not convinced by statistics. In his nightmares the corpulent cow which is Iowa to the passengers of the through train looks as lean as the kine of Pharaoh. And at the end of each year he experiences a mirage: his fields, his farm, his crops, and his cattle fade to a blank page on the credit side of the ledger. His computations lead him into blind alleys and his remedial legislation does not remedy. Then he curses again his pet enemies and also the land which is a deception to the eye, even as the fair body that hides a cancer.

But this contradiction is a recent experience. Twenty years ago it was unknown and before that inconceivable. The first settlers found a land which waited but the turn of a plow to uncover its golden riches. Their reports of the "strike" sped eastward, and soon the farmers who had used up the shallow soil of New England, the pioneers of the Middle Atlantic States who had found the cheap lands of the Northwest Territory equally unproductive, and the poor whites who had been forced out of the South by slave labor fell like locusts upon the virgin prairie, clean and level as a playful ocean and just as inexhaustible. Thus for thirty years after the first permanent settlement all roads west seemed to lead to Iowa. From the mountains of Kentucky and Tennessee, from the forests of Michigan, from the clay of Virginia and the sands of Ohio, from the mines of Pennsylvania, the orchards of New York, and the coast of New England came the seekers of a farmer's Eldorado. At the end of this period, 1870, Iowa's 1,194,752 inhabitants exceeded the population of Michigan which had been settled 150 years before. The numbers of burrowers in black loam had doubled, trebled, or quadrupled within each decade.

There are certain features of this million which cannot be overlooked by those who would know contemporary Iowa. Chief of these is the fact that no Northern State has ever had so great a proportion of original settlers from the South. Though there is a general impression that New Englanders settled Iowa, the earliest census shows that there were as many immigrants from Tennessee as from all of New England; there were more from Virginia than from Tennessee, and more Kentuckians than Virginians. Even as late as 1850 the Iowans from Southern States outnumbered the immigrants from New England almost six to one. By 1860 the influx of Yankees had changed this proportion to a little more than two to one in favor of the South but the Southerners still held most of the political offices, dominated State and local legislation, threw the State's sympathy to pro-slavery views, and generally fought all "Yankee notions and for'ard movements." And during the Civil War they were strong enough to attack companies of Northern soldiers training in the State. How much they contributed to the making of Iowa is a mooted question of doubtful importance. Both important and certain, however, is the fact that the Iowan of today is in the fullest sense an American; in his veins is mingled the blood of practically every Colonial. On the other hand, there is probably less foreign blood in the Iowan than in any other native of the Middle West. Few States in America have been settled with as small a percentage of foreign-born. For so uniformly rich was the soil that nothing remained here for the land-starved European who in other Middle-Western States was permitted to take the leavings of the natives.

And finally, it is vital to record that the settlers were of a definite and uniform character. Though the three streams of our westward movement conjoined in this State, the ambitious, the adventurous, and the lawless elements passed on. By virtue of her protected frontiers and peaceful Indian settlement, her monotonous and heavy tasks, her stable and rising wealth, Iowa appealed more than any

* Reproduction forbidden. Quotation limited to 300 words. Copyright, 1922, The Nation, Inc. All rights reserved.

This is the eighteenth article in the series entitled These United States. William Allen White wrote on Kansas, April 19; H. L. Mencken on Maryland, May 3; Beulah Amidon Ratliff on Mississippi, May 17; Dorothy Canfield Fisher on Vermont, May 31; Edmund Wilson, Jr., on New Jersey, June 14; Murray E. King on Utah, June 28; Ludwig Lewisohn on South Carolina, July 12; Anne Martin on Nevada, July 26; Sherwood Anderson on Ohio, August 9; Robert Herrick on Maine, August 23; Arthur Warner on Delaware, September 6; E. E. Miller on Tennessee, September 20; George P. West on California, October 4; Zona Gale on Wisconsin, October 18; Leonard Lanson Cline on Michigan, November 1; Basil Thompson on Louisiana, November 15, and Ernest H. Gruening on New York: I. The City, November 29.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other State to the cautious, prosaic, industrious, and mediocre. Here, at last, is the synthesis of an American agrarian type like the yeomanry of England and the peasantry of Russia. Here, too, is the answer to that rebellious song,

> When Adam delved and Eve span,
> Who was then the gentleman?

For cultural tradition and leisure are necessary to the making of gentlemen. The first Iowans do not possess; neither can they develop it, inasmuch as the second is contrary to all their standards of right living. He who has met the pathetic, puttering creatures known as retired Iowa farmers, or retired Iowa anything, with their tool sheds and truck gardens, their bees and their Fords, their incompleted real-estate deals and their worthless auction bargains, will thereafter find cosmic disturbance in the flutter of a leaf and universal significance in the movements of an ant. Yet this is all the leisure they know in "Ioway," and even this is reserved by public opinion for those who are on the grayer side of sixty.

The result has been justly called a dull, gray monotone. With the exceptions of a thinly disguised immorality and a spiritless church affiliation, rural Iowa—more than a million souls—has no interests beyond bread and butter. The movie and the pool room, the church social and the high-school entertainment are the amusements of town life. And the sophisticated city has its stock-company comedies, its lodges, its card parties, and its dances. There is really no community life in the State—neither folk-gatherings by the lowly nor common enterprises by the élite. And no one has been able to rouse this people to a participation in any creative expression of the commonwealth.

"But," cries the indignant Iowan, "look at some statistics. Man alive, just examine a few unbiased census reports! We have 'the highest percentage of literacy, 98.9, of any State in the Union or of any equal area in the world.' We have more schools, urban, rural, and consolidated, and a better school attendance than most anybody. We have libraries and museums that can accommodate thousands more people than use them. There are women's clubs that study lite'ture, poetry, music, and furniture, and all that sort of stuff. We get lectures and concerts and readings galore. We're among the first in city planning, in State music contests, and in community dramatics. And there's no State west of the Mississippi that can show more culture than we've got—that's a fact!"

All of which is perfectly true. And so, out of their own mouths are they confounded. They confuse literacy with education—witness their extensive primary-school system and their privately endowed, undernourished, and mendicant academies styled colleges. They mistake the social activities of a few liberated housewives for the cultural expression of a people—thus they visualize art as a half-dozen much-mispronounced, expensive, and authenticated masters; they understand poetry in terms of syndicated "people's bards" and leather-bound sets of undying and uncomprehended "classics"; they make the acquaintance of music in an annual enthusiastic meeting with an operatic banality. Their best theater is a child of the drama league of Chicago; their folk-songs are creations of Broadway; their epic theme is a misguided cyclone.

Descendants of New England stock, proudly conscious of what is expected from their heritage, are frankly perturbed about this condition. They plead the State's youth and they blame the South. "What can be expected of a State that has barely outlived her first hodge-podge and irrelevant laws, that is still unmindful of the work of her historical society?" they ask. Again they say: "The preponderance of Southerners in our early days formed the deadweight which still holds Iowa's eagle close to the ground." The South—autocratic county management which supplanted the intimate, democratic township system of New England; implacable opposition to the growth of governmental power through the fear of taxation and of encroachments on personal liberty; vigorous resistance to education at public expense, which is still reflected in the dearth of significant institutions of collegiate rank; and, above all, impenetrable indifference toward civic and social questions, which has been a most effective barrier to progressive legislation—the South, then, and all the backwardness that the word connotes is held responsible for the Iowaness of Iowa. And undoubtedly a good deal of energy has been wasted in combating Southern lethargy which might have been used in furthering New England ideals. But we need not look farther than Kansas to see what Iowa might have been with less dominant Southern influences—instead of the mulct law, outright prohibition; instead of a hopeless, languorous sanity, a militant puritanism.

Despite their comfort in flattering figures the Iowans manifest an unmistakable inferiority complex. Their jealous watch on the "Who's Who" for a proper representation of State celebrities, their far-fetched and persistent claims on the nation's great ones in the fields of art and literature, politics and finance, their furtive emulation of other States in publicity-giving enterprises, good, bad, or indifferent, are obvious signs. During the war it was this sense of inferiority rather than praiseworthy zeal which was responsible for an unabashed and militant system of extortion in liberty-loan drives. At the head of this violent effort for glory was, appropriately enough, the father of Hanford MacNider, the American Legion commander who has so violently demanded a bonus.

* * * * *

It is a curious coincidence that the fleeting observation-car impressions of the traveler and an equally superficial perusal of statistics should lead to the same conclusions. And thus Iowa's well-being is in danger of becoming a truism. Not one in a thousand sees that the goodly apple is rotten at the heart or suspects that Iowa's troubles are caused by something other than periods of national depression. As elsewhere, there is constant talk of a greater prosperity toward which Iowa is supposed to be moving as inevitably as the Mississippi flows to the Gulf. In their slight knowledge of both, the orators of popular causes are fond of comparing the river and the State. They seem equally placid, equally slow-moving, equally intent on one direction.

There is an analogy, to be sure, but a totally different one. For he who has plunged beneath the surface of the river knows there are countless currents, springs, and whirlpools that pull up-stream and to either side in obedience to hidden forces which can stem even the downward flow of waters. So it is with Iowa. There is the old, broad current pulling to the West, depositing its rich burden of superannuated farmers at "Loss Anjelees." There is the phenomenon of former feeders now either dry or drawing sustenance from the main stream—pioneer trails, again peopled, but the people headed in opposite directions. There is a boisterous

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rapid in the *Iowa Homestead*, an agricultural weekly which is the source of liberal power in the State. There is a cool, clear spring, the Des Moines *Register*, one of the most honest, thoughtful, and fearless dailies in the country. There is a Pierian spring at Grinnell whither flock the thirsty after knowledge. There is the vicious, seething whirlpool of a Greater Iowa Association that every so often sucks down some weak or foolish victim. And there are fine, deep, quiet backwaters—these peaceful colonies of Quakers at Oskaloosa, of Hollanders at Pella, and of religious communists at Amana.

All this is to be seen in the stream of Iowa life. And close observation discloses more—discloses that the seven times seven years of plenty are past, and that the lean years have come upon the land. We see that one of the purest landholding communities in the world has been transformed during the past thirty years into as bad a tenant-farmer State as any north of the Mason and Dixon's line. Even the statistics that are so dear to the Iowan heart support this view, though one must glance beneath the surface of census columns.

The first signs of this momentous change are evident in a study of population. In the decade of the sixties Iowa's numbers increased 96.9 per cent while the whole of the United States showed a growth of 26.6 per cent. During the following decade the State's population rose 36 per cent as against 26 gained by the nation. By 1880, however, the peak of Iowa's growth had been reached. Her most desirable land was taken up. She no longer showered welcomes on the immigrant. In the next ten years her numbers mounted 17 per cent; the country at large increased 25.5 per cent. And thereafter Iowa falls farther and farther behind the national expansion, until, in 1910, a period of unparalleled prosperity in the State, there is an absolute as well as a relative decline in population, a loss of 0.3 per cent. In the last decade there has been a gain but still 6.8 per cent below the national average.

Again, as early as 1890, began the exodus of enriched farmers to southern California. (Few have realized the extent of this migration; some idea may be obtained from the fact that at the annual picnic in 1920 more than 40,000 Iowans gathered at Los Angeles.) In the main, these farmers sold their land before leaving, but on terms which eventually proved worse for the buyer than any form of rental. It is then that Iowa achieved the distinction of having the most valuable farm land in the country—a reputation which did much to bring about a greater increase in land values than that of any other State. Speculation, with its consequent overvaluation, was inevitable, and the ridiculous prices of three, four, and five hundred dollars per acre were paid in the feverish anxiety to plant a stake in this Eldorado. The pioneers or their descendants, on the other hand, could not resist the temptation of selling. They found a hysterical mob of bidders who were convinced that Iowa land would be worth any price they chose to set on it and who were incapable of realizing at the moment that even the richest soil has a definite limit of production. The land was sold. Then came the reckoning.

Now this land-boom phenomenon has been recurrent. The last, started by the war and ended by the recent industrial depression, was the most intense, the most vivid, and the farthest-reaching in its results. The reckoning came quicker and is therefore more apparent. When the process of deflation set in, it was found that a majority of the transactions were "paper sales," bought with a minimum of cash payment and a maximum of mortgage, the interest on which —much less the principal—could never be gleaned from the land. By and large, the sellers were content, for this interest was greater than any income obtainable from rentals; but the purchasers quickly came to realize that they had become debtors in perpetuity.

What wonder that they grin sardonically today when the Iowa Chamber of Commerce proudly publishes the fact that there are 124,375 farm owners on the two hundred thousand odd farms in the State! The figures are meaningless; true to the records, yet false to the actual conditions. But these very figures, taken in sufficient detail, further reveal the situation. They show that the two counties which have the highest percentage of farm owners stand fifth and sixth from the bottom in a table of land values, whereas O'Brien and Lyon which have the greatest percentage of tenants rank twelfth and thirteenth among the ninety-six counties in the value of their farm lands. This corroborates the suspicion that only the poorer soil is still tilled by the so-called owners; the more expensive farms are rapidly reverting to the original possessors and are being worked by tenant labor. Thus mortgaged owner and broken tenant sweat to pay the increased bills of Iowans in southern California.

Important as this is in the life of Iowa, it gains still greater significance as a presage of national development. With the exploitation of our virgin resources goes the loss of individual independence and the growth of economic slavery. Elsewhere this exploitation has meant stripping of forests, impoverishing the soil, exhausting the mines, and draining of oil wells. In Iowa it is summed up in the one word, mortgage. Her resources are almost intact but the fruit of that land and the labor of her people are eaten by strangers.

"Go West, young man, go West," said Horace Greeley to a poor theological student. And the young man settled in Iowa, founded a town, helped build a college, and accumulated a modest fortune. Today if he made his way there, he could not supply the pettiest pulpit at starvation wages. Today it is more likely that the Iowa farmer's son will seek a church or shop or field in the East or farther West in an effort to pay off the mortgage, to stave off the day when another "owner" must turn tenant. Perhaps a dramatist will one day portray the tragedy of this act, the poignant sorrow of those who relinquish this yellow slip of paper, empty symbol of ownership, and return to till the soil on shares.

This tragedy is being enacted everywhere in the State. The attempts to forestall it are now political history—a history of transformation. Standpatter Senator Kenyon turned leader of the agricultural bloc and passed measures of relief that shocked the "interests." The boss-ridden Republican Party of the State turned out its regular candidates and elected in Kenyon's place Colonel Smith W. Brookhart, friend of the *Iowa Homestead* and avowed liberal, who is characteristically described by the small-town press—and not a few of the "college" presidents—as a "socialistic and anarchistic Bolshevik." The people turned a deaf ear to the radical-baiting of the Greater Iowa Association, and flocked to the meetings of the Nonpartisan League which a few years ago was unable to gain a foothold in the State. Local measures passed recently are in harmony with the new spirit, and students in college eco-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomics classes no longer vote unanimously to have Marx's "Communist Manifesto" barred from the shelves of the public libraries. Everyone demands reforms. Reactionary Iowa is insisting on measures as drastic as the Interstate Commerce Commission which its Senators brought into being during an earlier crisis.

Lest those who think that radicalism and idealism go hand in hand should grow unduly optimistic about the "soul of Iowa," let me state at once that there is no spiritual background, no generous purpose in this reform movement. The appeal to black, or rather, red magic for relief is hardly an omen of better days. Never was Ellis Parker Butler's motto for his State,

> Three millions yearly for manure,
> But not one cent for literature,

more pat. Seldom has a people been less interested in spiritual self-expression and more concerned with hog nutrition.

Nevertheless, neither the increased materialism, nor the astonishing new-found radicalism, nor the bounty of nature can avail much in the present situation. The luxuriant Iowa scene will remain as little changed, as deceptive as ever, but the aspect of the future is bleak indeed. What might have been a landed gentry must now become a burdened peasantry. Another land flowing with milk and honey must now feel the yoke of iron. Another set of prophets must sound lamentations. Perhaps a new spiritual life lies in this bleakness; perhaps the Mississippi will find its folk-songs more kin to the minors of the Volga than to the empty clangor of Broadway. Perhaps the farmer of Iowa will be first to follow the peasant of Russia in freeing his land from the yoke. Is not his sententious motto: "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain"?

The next article in the series These United States, to appear in The Nation *of December 27, will be* Massachusetts: A Roman Conquest, *by John Macy.*

Pierce Butler: Friend of Intolerance

By M. H. HEDGES

Minneapolis, December 4

NEWS of Pierce Butler's nomination to the Supreme Court of the United States caught him in a characteristic posture. With a number of associates he had just filed a brief before the State Supreme Court asking dismissal of a contempt case brought by the city of Minneapolis against officers and directors of the Minneapolis Street Railway Company. The aim of the city, when the lower court decided in its favor, was to get certain records to show what the officers had done with a mysterious $227,000 spent for alleged political purposes. Dispatches from Washington said that Butler had been chosen by the President because he was a "Democrat and a man of liberal views."

Be it said at the outset that Butler has never been put in a class with Attorney General Daugherty, another unpopular appointment of President Harding, even by his most outspoken critics. He has never been a lobbyist for corporations, and though he has been known as the attorney for the Great Northern Railway for years, he has never been on a salary. He is admitted even by his enemies to be the foremost corporation lawyer of the Northwest. What is it, then, that has drawn the fire of all kinds of people against him? It is a quality that endears him to his friends and makes him not so much hated by, as hateful to, his victims—a kind of intellectual brutality. Pierce Butler is a man physically big, and a burly man intellectually, and he carries this quality into all human relations. He has not done the work of corporations any more thoroughly than other men but he has done it with more consuming zeal. As a regent of the University of Minnesota he has not used the whip and gag with more rigor than others of his colleagues, but here again he has applied them with an inquisitorial intolerance that has made men unforgetting when they were the recipients of his attentions. And it is this peculiar attribute that men consider unbecoming the judicial mind. A professor at the university, in a letter to Senator Ladd, protesting against his confirmation by the Senate, declared: "Everything seems to indicate that we have here a personality of intense and unmitigated prejudices, accustomed to permitting these prejudices a free and unchecked expression in word and deed, even to the point of offensiveness in manner and attitude."

The "American Bar," the Who's Who of the legal profession, lists the firm of Butler, Mitchell, and Doherty, St. Paul, thus: "Firm is counsel for St. Paul Gas Light Company; Capital National Bank; St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company; Providence Life and Trust Company; Canadian Northern; New York Central Lines." In all his long career it is not recorded that Butler ever championed an unpaying or vicarious cause. His usual fee is reputed to be $1,000 a day. He has the distinction of exacting through court procedure the largest bill for damages from the street-car company ever recorded, about 10 years ago—that is all. His other achievements as a lawyer overshadow this. He represented the Great Northern Railroad and other Hill lines before the Interstate Commerce Commission, which hearing resulted in the present enormous valuation of nineteen billion dollars for the railroads of the nation. He represented Northwestern railroads in 1907, in the famous Minnesota rate cases, involving the State's right to regulate intra-State traffic. He represented the Minneapolis Gas Light Company in 1920 when that company went into technical receivership on plea of a subsidiary of the United Gas Company of Philadelphia of which the local gas company is also a subsidiary. The receivership wiped out a contract favorable to the city and boosted rates from 80 cents to $1.31 per unit. When the Minneapolis Steel and Machinery Company, during the war, refused to abide by the decision of the War Labor Board and grant a wage adjustment to its workers, Butler defended the corporation. And finally when John Meintz, an old farmer of Luverne, Minnesota, a stockholder in a Nonpartisan League weekly newspaper, was seized by thirty business men and delivered across the State's border to a mob, where he was tarred and feathered, it was Butler who defended the thirty respectable citizens with the plea that they were seeking to protect the old farmer.

This legal record throws into eclipse the work he has done for the Canadian Government in evaluating the Grand Trunk lines, or the shadowy service he performed for Taft in prosecuting the packers. The man in the street says today: "Yes, Butler is a trust-buster just as Kellogg is a trust-buster."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This corporation lawyer has come into contact with the public chiefly as a member of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota. He has held office through three administrations, and it is a known fact that his relations with each of the three presidents were strained. Butler as regent incarnates the spirit of private ownership of public institutions. He is credited with treating university presidents and deans as his particular employees, responsible to him personally for conduct of the various schools. It is reported that Dr. L. D. Coffman, the present president, resigned recently for a brief period when Butler sought to preempt his power to appoint instructors. Professor William Schaper, a national authority in the field of political science, relieved of his professorship during the war on the charge of pro-Germanism, went to Washington to protest against the Senate's confirmation of Butler's appointment. Professor Schaper was a believer in municipal ownership of public utilities. When he was dismissed Butler refused him hearing. Stanley Rypins, a Rhodes scholar, a popular instructor in English, also credits Butler with his discharge. Rypins was a member of the State branch of the Committee of Forty-eight. At regent meetings Butler with peculiar zest inquires into the qualifications of prospective instructors, prying into their political views. "Are they generally sound?" is the formula he and his colleagues use. A. W. Rankin, professor of education, retired, announced publicly that he would not oppose Butler's appointment because he was so glad to see him off the board of regents.

Before the news of his appointment reached Minnesota, liberal members of the new legislature were preparing to refuse him confirmation as regent if Governor Preus should send his name forward for approval. The Minneapolis City Council passed a resolution protesting against Butler's appointment to the bench on the ground that he would, as justice, decide against the city cases which he fought in lower courts in behalf of corporations.

In a few days it may be that the doors of the Supreme Court chamber will close behind Associate Justice Butler. He is fifty-five years old. Is it likely that the mere donning of judicial robes will change the inquisitorial zeal with which he has opposed the opinions of others, or change the intellectual habits of a lifetime formed in the service of corporations?

Contributors to This Issue

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO lived seven years in the Middle West, the last two and a half of which he spent in Iowa as managing editor of the *Grinnell Review* and director of publicity for the Grinnell College endowment-fund. He is now lecturer at Hunter College, New York City.

CARLETON BEALS is an American writer living in Rome.

M. H. HEDGES is now connected with the Minneapolis *Star*.

ADAMANTIOS TH. POLYZOIDES is editor of the New York *Atlantis*, an anti-Venizelist Greek daily newspaper.

PETROS P. TATANIS is publisher of the Venizelist *National Herald*, also printed in New York.

HERBERT W. HORWILL is a British journalist, for many years correspondent for *The Nation* and the New York *Evening Post* in London.

PITTS SANBORN is the musical editor of the New York *Globe*.

Who Murdered the Statesmen of Greece?

By ADAMANTIOS TH. POLYZOIDES

"ON the forenoon of November 28 a little group of *statesmen and one soldier—formerly a general in* supreme command of the Greek army—strolled into a stone-flagged yard and faced death like gentlemen." This happened in Athens, the capital of the glory that was Greece. The men thus to die were Demetrios Gounaris, three times Premier of Greece, six times Minister, leader of the constitutional majority in the Hellenic National Assembly elected on November 14, 1920, and arbitrarily dissolved by the recent military revolution, and chief of the Popular Party of Greece; Nicholas Stratos, a former Premier and Minister, leader of the Reformist Party; Petros Protopapadakis, former Premier and several times Minister of Finance; George Baltadjis, former Minister for Foreign Affairs, who held that portfolio under at least half a dozen different governments; Nicholas Theotokis, former Greek Minister in Berlin and more recently Minister of War; and George Hadjianestis, a brigadier general, recently in supreme command of the Hellenic forces in Asia Minor. The men who accused, indicted, convicted, sentenced, and executed these Greek leaders were a little band of Greek army officers, ranking from colonel down, all recently returned from the rout of Asia Minor and forming a self-appointed revolutionary committee. The description of the murder as given above is that of the Athens correspondent of the United Press.

The murderers, for no other name applies to the perpetrators of this outrage, in explaining their deed before the world, said that they killed their victims because they held them responsible for the return of King Constantine, the alienation of the Entente's sympathy for Greece, and the military disaster in Asia Minor. The authors of the tragedy must have a very low opinion of the average intelligence of the world outside of Athens if they think that such excuses are sufficient to condone their misdeeds. Should they succeed in their effort we must credit them with the ability to "get away with murder." The truth lies elsewhere.

When the Great War started Greece had a King who did not believe in everything the Allies promised and preached. At the same time she had a Prime Minister who aimed to become one of the leading statesmen of Europe, using Greece as the means thereto. Constantine looked for expansion along dry territory, reaching through Macedonia and Thrace to Constantinople. Venizelos preferred to play to the gallery by conceiving the Smyrna expedition as early as 1915. Constantine wanted to play safe; Venizelos preferred the high stakes. The King tried for nearly three years to keep out of the game; Venizelos sat down at the table from the first, tried his hand in every deal, played all his tricks, and finally fell. This was in November, 1920, when the general election in Greece went overwhelmingly against him in a landslide that cost him even his seat in Parliament.

Demetrios Gounaris, the leader of the victorious coalition, assumed control in Athens; King Constantine was recalled shortly afterwards to the throne by 98 per cent of the vote of the entire electorate. The whole regime, which was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the Asia Minor adventure of Venizelos, came to power only to find the country inextricably engaged in a great war. Constantine and Gounaris found themselves faced with a terrible dilemma; they had either to revert to their old program and withdraw as best they could from Asia Minor, thus exposing themselves to the unscrupulous attacks of the opposition, or to renew the war with additional vigor. They chose the second alternative, and in so doing they sealed their doom.

Why did the governments of which Gounaris has been the leading spirit continue the war in Asia Minor after the Venizelist defeat? What was their source of encouragement? It remained for Demetrios Gounaris to throw a sinister light into that dark corner of Greek history, when in his first and only appearance before the Revolutionary Court Martial, fighting for his honor rather than for his life, he announced that he acted the way he did because he had the secret but none the less official encouragement of the British Government, embodied in a written promise bearing the signature of Lord Curzon himself. Thus, while Premier Lloyd George officially denounced the anti-Venizelist regime and shut off the official sources of credit for Greece, another of the ministers of the British Crown, who holds the same position under Bonar Law, was solemnly assuring Greece that Great Britain had not changed her friendship for Greece nor her policy in the Near East simply because a new set of men were in power in Athens.

The Revolutionary Court of Athens promptly ruled out the Gounaris declaration, and on the next day the former Greek Premier fell ill with typhoid fever, and was transferred to a hospital which he never left until the day when he was carried in a stretcher and, ill with a fever of 104 degrees, shot to death. His Foreign Minister, his Finance Minister, his War Minister and his chief assistant, and the late generalissimio in Asia Minor were killed in the same hour. A Shakespearean tragedy indeed, in which all the chief characters of the drama are doomed, and die carrying their secrets with them.

Ominous questions arise. Who started the revolution of September 26? By whose permission did the Greek navy abandon Constantinople to transfer the rebellious Greek troops to Athens, there to overthrow the constitutional regime? Who told the revolutionaries to parade before the French Legation, shouting for France, on the first day of their entrance into Athens? Why was it that the British Minister at Athens, who saved Gounaris and his companions from assassination on September 28, was not able to save them two months later, when their fate was known beforehand? Why was King Constantine not only allowed to leave Athens unmolested, but also given the escort of a British admiral, and five thousand pounds sterling in cash at a time when the Greek treasury was empty? Why is it that the British Minister left Athens hurriedly after the murders of the premiers, and went straightway to Lausanne to communicate with Lord Curzon? Why all this nervousness in the House of Commons at the innocent remarks of Ramsay MacDonald regarding British responsibility for the bloody happenings in Athens? Why does Mr. Venizelos, after a three-day silence, assume responsibility for the killings, in the face of universal protest? And to put the whole issue more bluntly: What is the responsibility of the Entente for the recent murders in Athens, committed by men who would not dare touch a hair of their enemies' heads without outside support?

Justifiable Executions

By PETROS P. TATANIS

THE first impression upon a large number of American editors created by the execution of the six Greek officials has been regrettable. The details of the events which have taken place in Greece have not yet reached America. The Revolutionary Government, overwhelmed by a vast task of caring for nearly 2,000,000 refugees, and of clearing the country of all those responsible for the unprecedented catastrophe, have had no opportunity of presenting their case before the world tribunal. The enemies of the present Government have had the field of propaganda all to themselves. To those, however, who know the facts, who are in possession of the documentary evidence of the guilt of the rulers of Greece during the last two years, the action of the revolutionary authorities appears natural, necessary, and eminently just.

Most people outside of Greece believe that the sentence to death of the six Greek officials was based upon: (1) Partisan fanaticism; (2) vengeance for failure to carry out a bona-fide program. Had the Greek Revolutionary Government founded its decision upon these two considerations, it would have justly deserved universal condemnation. But the facts are entirely different: The Revolutionary Government consists largely of former anti-Venizelists, higher officers who voted against Venizelos and in favor of Constantine and his Ministers in 1920. These officers commanded the Greek armies in Anatolia. They experienced the disastrous effects of the policies of Constantine and his friends. And the same royalist officers organized the revolution, marched the Greek troops upon Athens, drove Constantine out, and by a legally constituted tribunal reached the following conclusions:

1. The executed Ministers deliberately misled the Greek nation in 1920, with assurances that England had pledged her assistance to Constantine if he were returned to Greece.

2. In the course of the next two years France, Great Britain, and the United States had warned them that unless Constantine was removed from the Greek throne, Greece would not be sustained in her Asia Minor efforts; the Greek Government would not be recognized; loans would not be advanced or credits given for the continuance of the war.

3. In spite of these warnings, in spite of the evident ruin to which Greece was headed, the executed Premiers and Ministers refused to tell the people the truth and clung to their office out of mere hatred of Venizelos.

4. In 1921, Venizelos warned them against the advance upon Angora.

5. The advance upon Angora was dictated, according to the testimony of General Papoulas, the Royalist Commander-in-Chief only by political and dynastic reasons.

6. Fearing the feeling in the army which had turned Venizelist, the executed premiers removed the experienced and able officers, replaced them by mere political appointees, and placed in command of the army an irresponsible palace general who had never seen any field service.

7. The executed ministers, according to the testimony of some of them, negotiated with Kemal for the surrender of Asia Minor, having trusted Kemal's pledges not to massacre the Christians.

Unquestionably, when these facts contained in the unassailable evidence of the royalist witnesses are placed before the world by the Greek Government, the opinion of all just men will sustain the action of the revolutionary committee.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Progressive Conference

An Englishman's Impressions

Washington, December 4

NO foreign visitor, I suppose, was ever admitted to a secret American political caucus. The editor of the London *Spectator* has been telling us, in his recent autobiography, how he was once invited to be present at a session of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, but the secrets of the inner circles of the party organizations are more jealously guarded than those of the Administration. The next best thing must surely be the opportunity of attending such a conference as that held in Washington on December 2, when the progressive movement initiated at the private meeting of Senators and Representatives on the previous day reached its second stage. To an English journalist who for many years has been following American politics afar off, this closer view was a rare and highly valued privilege.

One of the most interesting features of the conference was the presence of Senator La Follette in the chair. There can be no more conclusive evidence of a turn in the tide of public opinion than the general recognition in the American press, by foes as well as friends, of the influence exerted by him at the Capitol today. It is as startling a *bouleversement* as Ramsay MacDonald's appearance in the British Parliament in the role of Leader of the Opposition. In both countries Philip drunk has evidently been sobering fast. To me, not the least piquant incident of the conference was the cooperation of Samuel Gompers in a movement headed by Senator La Follette. Remembering as I do his attitude toward pacifists on his visit to England during the war, I infer that something must have changed. I am sure it is not La Follette.

It was well worth while, too, to be able to get a first-hand impression of the personality of those embattled farmers of the West who have been so sorely disturbing the plans of the party managers. There was little trace of rusticity about these farmer Senators and Congressmen, and the graphic pictures they drew of the plight of agriculture in their respective States would not have been bettered if they had been touched up by trained advocates. Indeed, the association in this movement for the first time of farmers, city industrial workers, and "intellectuals"—if one may use an inadequate but convenient term—is a development that is full of promise for the rescue of public life from the control of the boss and the professional politician and their masters of special privilege.

Taking warning, presumably, from the fate of that Bull Moose, which so soon shriveled into a *ridiculus mus*, the promoters of this movement are set against the formation of a third party. It is a gallant adventure to attempt to bring about drastic reforms through the agency of party organizations whose accredited leaders regard these reforms with intense repugnance. It is like making a refractory boy provide the rod that is to chastise him. This experiment in political mechanics will be watched with interest by many besides those who are directly concerned in its result. The offer just made by the Administration to the farming interests is interpreted in some quarters, I see, as likely to "take the wind out of the sails" of Senator La Follette and his associates. If they had been starting a new party, that is clearly what it might have done. But, inasmuch as it is their deliberate purpose to make the existing parties their instruments, this concession by the Government must obviously count as a point scored by the progressive group.

To an English observer this conference suggested some curious contrasts with the political methods to which he is accustomed. It is a constant wonder to us how American politicians can accomplish so much—or, indeed, anything at all—when they conduct their business in such a happy-go-lucky fashion. This was the most slovenly political meeting I have ever attended. It was called for ten o'clock, but it did not actually begin until 10:50, and no one showed any impatience at the delay. Although the meeting was avowedly one of sympathizers with a particular movement and important questions of policy were decided by the vote of those present, there was no scrutinizing of invitations at the door, and no precaution was taken lest any unfriendly or malicious element should intrude. It was not until the chairman had given his address and was proceeding to read the resolution adopted at the previous day's caucus that the happy thought occurred to some one that it would be as well for the meeting to be provided with a secretary. Most of the day was occupied in listening to set speeches, and it was only at the end of the afternoon that there came an opportunity of discussing the policy of the movement. Perhaps the explanation is that, just as the real business of Congress is transacted in the cloak-rooms rather than in the debates of the legislative chamber, so also in meetings of this type the gossip of groups of members really predetermines the more formal proceedings.

Another thing that struck me as quite un-English was the attitude of the conference to the fundamental question of the effective expression of the popular will. "Bringing the government back to the people" was the topic of many of the addresses, and no one seemed to have the least doubt of the failure of the present system to make the real mind of the electorate prevail. I must confess my amazement at the remedies suggested. The general demand was for further State regulation of the activities of parties, particularly in the matter of the holding of primaries. Nothing could be more utterly alien to British ideas and practice. Any proposal that the State should determine the methods of the parties in nominating their candidates, or in transacting any other business, would not simply be turned down; it would be hooted down. Englishmen of all parties and of no party would be up in arms at once against any such interference with "the liberties of the subject." One might as well propose that Parliament should determine how the Athenaeum Club should elect its committee or how the Wesleyan Conference should elect its President. From beginning to end of an election campaign the State is not even aware of the existence of political parties. If John Smith stands for Parliament, he appears on his nomination paper as John Smith, with his occupation and place of residence but with no mention whatever of his party affiliation. The same remark applies to the ballot paper presented to the electors at the polling booths, to the declaration of the result made by the returning officer, and to the writ that the successful candidate presents when he takes his seat. If you were to tell an English voter that Americans actually submit to the State regulation of their meetings in which their parties nominate candidates for public office, he would probably express his emotion at such strange news by adopting the words that Cowper puts into the mouth of Robinson Crusoe—"Their tameness is shocking to me."

HERBERT W. HORWILL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

THE Drifter is proud to confess that he has friends in prison. Not long ago he went to see one of them, a victim of the anti-red hysteria. He was ushered in to wait his friend's coming in the great center room around which the cell blocks rise, tier on tier. The wait was rather long. Seated around the dull gray room, gray-clad prisoners talked in low tones with friends; hard-featured keepers came and went; one suaver than the rest escorted a cheerful crowd of sightseers on a personally conducted tour of one of democracy's famous institutions. The air was the sort found only in prisons—lifeless, touched with a smell of disinfectant, fit only to nurture gray and pallid men. Not, surely, the kind of air best suited to cure sick souls.

* * * * *

WHEN the prisoner arrived he did not complain, he had not lost hope, his eyes were clear. Though he lives and works under the silence rule except for brief periods of recreation, his soul dwells in the world of men and events and ideas. He talked of school, of the books he was reading, of his progress in English; but more eagerly he talked of what the workers were doing. The Drifter asked if he ever read *The Nation*. "Sometimes," was the answer, "and I should like to see it regularly." The Drifter offered to send it to him. "Better ask the Warden first," his friend advised. So when his visit was over the Drifter sought out the Warden, who looked—well, let us say like a warden and let it go at that. The following conversation ensued:

THE DRIFTER: What is your rule about admitting magazines to prisoners?

WARDEN: We let them in if they are all right.

DRIFTER: I see. May I ask if *The Nation* is all right? I should like to send it to my friend.

WARDEN: I don't know. We'd have to look it over before we decide.

DRIFTER: Look it over for what?

WARDEN: Socialism. We can't let socialism get in here. Is *The Nation* socialist?

DRIFTER: My friend the Editor says not. But what do you mean by socialist and what harm can it do?

WARDEN: A lot. We can't have anarchy in here.

DRIFTER: But I thought you said you yere looking for socialism?

WARDEN: Well, we can't have that either.

DRIFTER: What is your test of socialism?

WARDEN: Common sense.

DRIFTER: Whose common sense?

WARDEN: Well, usually the chaplain reads it. I guess you'd better not send *The Nation*.

DRIFTER: But I told you it was not a socialist paper.

WARDEN (changing tone): Well, send it along if you want to. Maybe it's here now. We have thirty papers in our library.

* * * * *

THE Drifter still regrets that he did not see the thirty papers, but by the time the conversation was over he had reached the office door and was soon outside. He consoled himself by thinking that he could get his friend the Editor to try *The Nation* on the chaplain. Thus thinking he walked out. When he looked up he saw Bunker Hill Monument.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

The *Monitor* Relaxes

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Referring to the enumeration, in Mr. Villard's article of November 8, of the several classes of advertising excluded from the *Christian Science Monitor*, I am inclined to believe that that excellent newspaper's standard is not quite so severe as he paints it. The *Monitor* of November 10 contained the following display advertisement:

SLIM-LIMB HOSIERY

> The "Bryn Mawr," a new type of silk hosiery for women that fills a long-felt need for a stocking that is as slender through the leg as a misses' stocking, but has the length of a woman's stocking.

Evidently, the *Monitor's* scruples are not so inflexible as to block the relief of this particular "long-felt need" of the Boston ladies. Out our way, I gratefully beg to report, the architecture of the feminine extremities is less rectilinear.

Berkeley, California, November 18 A. T. PUTNAM

"Mr. Lloyd George's New War"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your recent editorial, Mr. Lloyd George's New War, there are misstatements: 1. You say: "We discover that even the Allies have never proposed excluding the Turk from Europe. From the beginning they have recognized that Constantinople and Eastern Thrace are in fact Turkish." Just before our Government declared war, a request went to the Allies to state their war aims. The reply, written by a Frenchman for the Allies, dated January 10, 1917, included the following: "The enfranchisement of populations subject to the bloody tyranny of the Turks and the expulsion from Europe of the Ottoman Empire, decidedly alien to Western civilization." Even at the Peace Conference at Paris Constantinople was not recognized as Turkish and the agreement was to establish an international state of Constantinople. It was not until the Treaty of Sèvres was signed in 1920 that the decision was reached to give Constantinople back to the Turks and that decision included not all of Eastern Thrace but only a very small portion of it.

2. It was not British military and naval pressure at Constantinople which forced the Turkish Government at Constantinople to sign the Sèvres treaty. The bitterest words in connection with the signing of that treaty were spoken by a Frenchman, M. Millerand. He said: "It would neither be just nor would it conduce to lasting peace in the Near and Middle East that large masses of non-Turkish nationality should be forced to remain under Turkish rule."

3. There is no evidence to my knowledge that the British Government subsidized the Greeks to fight the Nationalist Turks, and spokesmen for the British Government have definitely stated that no aid was given by that Government in any way to the Greeks.

4. It seems to me that your readers should know that back in the days of the Peace Conference, when Orlando had furiously withdrawn and there was danger that the Italians would seize Smyrna in accordance with a treaty made during the war, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and President Wilson joined in requesting Venizelos to rush troops into Smyrna, because it had already been agreed that the Greeks were to have the Smyrna area. After the Italian menace passed, the French saw the Greek menace rising. Economic jealousy of Greece, Latin fear that the "New Rome" might be reestablished at Constantinople, and French jealousy of British success in Constantinople led France to try to establish its influence in Angora.

5. The invitation to representatives of the Nationalist Turks

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to come to London for the conference in February, 1921, was not from Great Britain alone but from all the Allies.

6. The proposals for modification of the Sèvres treaty made last March were accepted by the Turks with such important modifications as to amount to a rejection. One of these modifications was that the Greeks were to evacuate Asia Minor at once.

7. In the British stand at Chanak no promise was broken. The purpose rather was to keep to the agreement made in March to see that a conference preceded the restoration of Thrace and Constantinople to the Turks, in order to safeguard the rights of minorities and to prevent the possible recurrence on a larger scale at Constantinople of the tragic events that had just transpired at Smyrna.

8. A word should be said with regard to the Sèvres treaty. One of the famous Fourteen Points reads: "The other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured their undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development." By the Sèvres treaty the Arabs of Syria and Mesopotamia, who were already desirous of being separated from the Ottoman Empire, were given an opportunity for autonomous development. The Smyrna area had a Greek majority in population and was assigned to the Greeks. Provision was made for the establishment of a territory in the northeast corner to which the Armenian refugees could return and begin an autonomous development of their own. Constantinople was given back to the Turks, as was also Cilicia which had been definitely promised by the French to the Armenians. Provisions were made for a plebiscite in Kurdistan to determine whether the population there desired to be independent of Turkey or not. All the Turkish portions of Turkey and more were left absolutely intact. No indemnity was demanded and Turkey fared infinitely better than a defeated country had a right to expect.

New York, October 17 GEORGE R. MONTGOMERY,
Director, the Armenia America Society

[(1) Mr. Montgomery is in part right, but during the war Allied statesmen made a great many contradictory statements, as occasion demanded. Part of their difficulty in agreeing upon the terms of the Treaty of Sèvres was due to the fact that British war-time agreements with French, Arabs, Jews, Greeks, and Italians did not jibe. There was talk at Paris of alienating Constantinople; but the Allies never proposed terms to the Turks which excluded them from Europe. The Treaty of Sèvres was not born in a day; the decision to return Constantinople, there confirmed, was no hasty act but the product of long deliberation. (2) M. Millerand may have used harsh words, but the British troops and the British warships at Constantinople were the effective agents. (3) The British Government has denied that as a government it aided the Greeks. At one time it made similar statements about certain White Russian movements. But, like those Russians, the Greeks used British guns and ammunition, and had no money with which to pay for them. It is hard to believe that the British Government was not a party to the transaction; we do not believe that Mr. Montgomery believes Mr. Lloyd George to have had no part in it. (4) Mr. Montgomery's remarks about the Italian claim to Smyrna, based upon a war-time treaty, and the Franco-British-American encouragement to M. Venizelos to rush troops into Smyrna in violation of the war-time agreement, seem to confirm the point of our editorial. (5) This is true, but the prime mover was Mr. Lloyd George. (6) The Greek Parliament rejected the London proposals *in toto* even before they were formally presented (New York *Times*, March 2, 1921); the Turks accepted them subject only to modifications in date which do not seem to us to justify Mr. Montgomery's opinion. (7) What may have been the real purpose of the British stand at Chanak is a matter of opinion, and might require a psychoanalyst for certainty. Our opinion is that fear of loss of the present British control of the all-important Straits was the major factor. (8) The Treaty of Sèvres imposed upon Turkey foreign control of her finances, her customs, her railroads, and her army. It also established the Greeks in the province of Smyrna, which is not Greek—only the city of Smyrna is preponderantly Greek—and left the Straits in Allied hands. After its signature the Allies remained in Constantinople and in Eastern Thrace, and the British tolerated and probably encouraged the Greek advance into Anatolia. Such a policy invited Kemal's revolt, and Mr. Lloyd George's appeal to the world to aid him in a holy stand at Chanak seems to us to have been disingenuous, uncalled for, and a threat to the peace of the world.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

Can the Church Be Pacifist?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: "How seriously are we to take the church agitation for peace?" asks John Haynes Holmes in *The Nation* for October 25. Then he quotes Bernard Shaw as wondering how the church has the face to exist after its attitude on the late war. When will Mr. Holmes and Mr. Shaw realize that the world, in the years from 1914 to 1918, played one scene of a very old drama in which the church has always taken the same role?

What is a church? It is the social institution which ministers to man's beliefs—to the emotional or instinctive side of his nature that reaches out into the unknown and forward into the beyond. The church has never made its appeal to reason. That function has devolved upon the school and other institutions that have spoken for classified knowledge. Since the functioning of the church is confined to the realm of the emotions, it can hardly be expected to play a part in the handling of scientific problems.

Modern war is science—a product of the reasoning faculties. Personal altercations are frequently the result of emotional upheavals, but modern wars are the product, not of the emotional reactions of individuals, but of the carefully laid plans of great industrial, commercial, diplomatic, and military institutons, all of which work out and blue-print wars in advance, and build the machines with which destruction is to be wrought.

How then shall the church act on the question of war? From an emotional standpoint of course—on a basis of love or of hate: of fear or of faith. That is, it will not make or unmake wars—it will react to wars, after they are made or unmade, as it reacts to any other body of fact.

There are about 140,000 ministers and priests in the United States. Before and after the World War they were for peace. During the war they were for war. Why was this? Because the people were for peace before and after the war and for war during the war, and the church, as the institution that reflects their emotional states, taught a corresponding doctrine.

But why did the church gradually swing over to a war attitude, even before the United States went to war? First because the American people were being gradually won over to the war position by the newspapers and the other propaganda forces; second, because the church, with annual expenditure of more than a third of a billion dollars, must go for financial assistance to the same group of financial interests that were using the newspapers to make a war.

The ruling classes have had many reasons for making wars, but whatever the reason they have always had a dependable ally in the emotional exaltation that was stirred up by the church. Historically it is quite fair to say that one of the functions of the church has been to arouse people in order that they might be more eager to fight. Certainly that is the experience of the past century.

There have been Friends, Mennonites, and other small sects that have made an honorable record as opponents to war. Jesus and His immediate followers (with the possible exception of Peter) were pacifists, but since the institutionalizing of the Christian church, and its expropriation by Constantine, it has been consistently and invariably pro-war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Holmes wants to know whether the Christian church can be pacifist. As well ask whether it can be radical. Logic and experience alike make a negative reply inevitable.

New York, November 1 SCOTT NEARING

The Convening of the New Congress

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Public attention has been called to the fact that the Congress selected at the last election will not in the ordinary course of events meet until December, 1923, thus delaying the carrying into effect of the popular will as expressed by the election. In the general discussion it has been taken for granted that this unfair situation is inevitable, but a study of the law reveals the following: The Constitution provides (Art. I, Sec. 4, Par. 2) that "Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, *unless they shall by law appoint a different day.*" Later (in 1872) Congress enacted this law (U. S. R. S., Sec. 25): ". . . The Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, 1876 . . . and every second year thereafter, is established as the day of election . . . of Representatives and delegates to the Congress commencing on the fourth day of March next thereafter."

It will thus be seen that the present procedure is merely a result of custom, dictated originally as shown in the debates at the time of formulating the Constitution because meetings in "the summer would interfere too much with private business, that of almost all the probable members being more or less connected with agriculture." It is clearly within the power of the present Congress before adjournment to fix March 4 as the date for the convening of the new Congress and thus avoid the spectacle of defeated and repudiated partisans trying to jam through legislation of prime importance in the last days of their term after being repudiated by the electorate.

New York, November 23 JONAH J. GOLDSTEIN

[The difficulty is in persuading a lame-duck Congress to seal the doom of its own favored legislation. Mr. Goldstein's suggestion does not meet this.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

A Soldier to the President

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have been urged by a number of people who have read the inclosed letter to allow others to know how this matter is viewed by an ex-service man. This letter is one of a large number of similar import that have gone to Washington since the circulation of the Open Letter to President Harding sent recently by fifty-two war-time prisoners still in Leavenworth for expression of opinion.

New York, November 1 ESTHER HARLAN

To the President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

I respectfully request that you grant a general amnesty to the political prisoners confined on charges brought under the Espionage Act. During the time that I was serving with the American Expeditionary Force in France I was greatly disturbed by news of the extraordinary intolerance of opinion that was developing in the United States. Now I am much more disturbed that, when there is no longer any excuse for it nor any palliation for remaining symptoms of war hysteria, men should be kept in confinement whose only offense is that during strenuous times they stood up for the principle of freedom of speech.

I am ready at any time to give myself whole-heartedly to the defense of this country's institutions, believing that they were founded to safeguard its citizens as to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I have always supposed that it was one of the cardinal beliefs of the men who have made this country that the safety of those institutions depended upon the freedom with which individuals were allowed to express themselves; not on the severity with which they were repressed. It will be a very sad day for great numbers of us who are loyal Americans when we are forced to believe that one may no longer in this country safely express any opinions except those sanctioned by the majority.

I believe, Mr. President, that to free these men will be quite consistent with the high standard of public duty that you have set for yourself, and that you will by such an act show yourself at the same time just, merciful, and a careful guardian of your country's welfare. That the wrong is none of your creating will detract nothing from the credit you may gain by righting it. Every day of confinement is an added injustice. With all respect to you and to your high office I urge that action be speedy.

Yours respectfully,
R. L. BLANCHARD

I am thirty-four years of age, born an American citizen of old American stock. I am an A.M. of Brown University where I was at one time an instructor. I enlisted at the beginning of the war, was later commissioned, served at St. Mihiel and in the Argonne, and was honorably discharged with the grade of Captain C. A. C. Recently I have been treasurer and director of a large industrial concern.

From the Strike Region

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The public generally thinks the coal strike of 1922 is a thing of the past, but this is hardly the case. Several thousand miners are still on strike. Many of them are living in tents, stables, garages, and barracks furnished by the miners' union. Western Pennsylvania is still an armed camp. So far, however, no one is armed but the State cossacks and the mine guards, but if they continue to flourish arms in the faces of the miners, how long will it be until these retaliate? Are we to have a repetition of the West Virginia mine war in western Pennsylvania in the Connellsville region? Many of the coke companies refuse to furnish coal at any price for local consumption. This rule forces consumers in this great coal-field to ship coal here from other fields and helps to demoralize freight traffic. Coal in this district is mined and sold largely by the bushel. Coal that costs three and a quarter cents per bushel to mine costs the consumer eighteen cents per bushel right by the mine. The high freight rates, the inability of the railroads to deliver coal, and the refusal of the coke companies to sell to local consumers force the consumers in this great coal-field to use inferior grades of coal at extortionate prices. It has been charged that the same group of men own the coal and the railroads. If so, cross shipment may be a good thing for the owners, but the consumers get it in the neck.

Hopwood, Pa., November 6 ISAAC MURPHY

"How Can We Get Together?"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: For the last two years, at least, I have wished I knew someone to whom I could write letters of opinion on all sorts of subjects, someone who would enjoy reading them and replying in kind. To date I have not found even one such person. There must be, I imagine, hundreds of others in a similar situation—chiefly young people, like myself, who are intensely interested in books, but are not writers; or in art, but are not artists; or in radicalism, but are not agitators. We have no way of getting acquainted, even by letter, with one another; and we all feel that not only would it be presumptuous of us to bother those whose names are famous, but that we have little to offer them in return for their attention.

How can we get together? Shall we add another to the ten thousand-odd periodicals now published? Shall we add another to the hundred thousand-odd clubs in existence—a correspondence club of some sort? Or is there an organization already flourishing, or even barely existing, which will meet our wants?

My duties as instructor in English and history are not too exacting to allow me to act, temporarily, as a distributing center for the ideas and views of those whom my suggestion may interest.

K. M. I., Lyndon, Ky., November 8 JOHN M. PRICE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

Is Democracy Recoverable?

Shall It Be Again? By John Kenneth Turner. B. W. Huebsch. $2.50.

Imperial Washington. By R. F. Pettigrew. Charles H. Kerr and Company. $1.25.

ONE general principle inherent in our democracy to which no American will grudge at least lip-service is that both sides of every question should be heard. The day in court, the rights of the minority, the other fellow's story have been deemed as nearly sacred as anything in our ethics. And to those who offer more than mock fealty to so essential a doctrine the reading of "Shall It Be Again?" and "Imperial Washington" is strongly recommended.

"No one will dispute," begins Mr. Turner, "that notwithstanding complete victory . . . the promised goal, permanent peace, was not attained." His painstaking review of events that led us into the great war and to that victory induces the questions: "What *one* fine promise did the 'noble democracies' fulfil? What *one* pernicious institution did they banish from the earth? What *one* thing did they do for democracy? Has America more or fewer friends abroad than it had in 1914 or 1916? Are we more 'united' as we were informed we would be? Are our personal liberties more or less secure than they were before? Are the social poles nearer together or wider apart? What *one* domestic evil has been corrected at home?" It should not be inferred from these queries that the book is a mere adventure in opinion. On the contrary it is an extraordinary amassing of quotations, a masterful collation of facts. Unlike other war post-mortems it is not an elaborate effort to whitewash, to justify, or to reveal belatedly hitherto well-guarded evidence. It is an appeal to Americans by an American. If it be biased, it is biased only in favor of America's most cherished principles. If it be propaganda, it is propaganda only for the spirit of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

The book is dedicated to "the lads who will come under the next draft" but is not confined to an analysis of the recent conflict. Chapters on Mexico, on Nicaragua, on post-war trends and current indications are excellent. "The story of Nicaragua is Pan-Americanism as Pan-Americanism is. This is the Monroe Doctrine not as it is written, but as it is applied. This is 'protecting American lives and property.'" But the essence of his argument is to be found in the sentences: "In no modern country can autocracy sit in the saddle as autocracy. It must masquerade as democracy. So the machinery of deceit is set up." Mr. Turner's book is a valiant unmasking, which concludes that "There remains a single chance to derive a benefit from the war just past. It is to perceive the lesson and act upon it"; and he furnishes a concrete program, which by itself refutes any possible criticism that he is not "constructive," a program which might well embody the foreign policy of any future political party that aims honestly to serve cardinal American principles. Anyone sincerely interested in them and in preserving the coming generations from the horrors this one has just witnessed could do no better than to help reprint and broadcast these terse recommendations—by the million.

If there is an adverse criticism to be made it is that occasionally Mr. Turner allows his crusading enthusiasm to minimize here and to overstress there. He is a little too sure. His conclusions shell out a bit too neatly. Many who follow his argument with sympathy will disagree with the extreme characterization of a wholly and deliberately sinister Woodrow Wilson. In rending the United States he lets off Germany far too easily—though it should be made clear that his book is no defense of Germany but an indictment of recent and current American policy.

Senator Pettigrew's book approaches the same subject from a different angle. Mr. Turner writes as an observer, as a trained reporter, Mr. Pettigrew as a principal, as an insider. Twelve years as South Dakota's representative in the Senate gave him first-hand knowledge of politico-economic currents, of intrigues, "deals," steals, of the interplay of forces behind the scenes. He knew personally ten Presidents. He speaks therefore with unexceptionable authority. Revelations from such a source are well-nigh unique. But readers will find the book no smoothly running treatise. It is tempestuous, virulent, opinionated. It names names, passes the lie direct, crucifies. But its force is not impaired thereby. It is a stirring human document, irresistible in many of its facts and in its fervor. If its generalizations are at times too sweeping, its deductions too inclusive, its conclusions occasionally awry, these shortcomings are unimportant in the unfolding of this epic of an American political career. They are regrettable only in that they will cause the book to be more easily ignored and dismissed by those interested in so doing. It would have been better too if Senator Pettigrew had called in one of several expert literary collaborators, and instead of the cheaply printed book teeming with typographical errors had secured a well-edited and handsomely wrought volume. His material deserves a better handling. In craftsmanship it will not stand comparison with Mr. Turner's, which is a rare achievement in arrangement, compactness, and sequence, although this superior quality is more vital to a compilation than to source material.

"Like most American boys," writes Senator Pettigrew, "I had been brought up to believe that the United States had a government of the people, by the people, for the people. My first real impressions to the contrary were obtained during my early experiences with Dakota politics. There I learned how the machinery of government is manipulated in the interest of those who are behind it." Then follows a history of personal encounters with the bosses, with the wire-pullers, the land-grabbers, the franchise purloiners, the legal charlatans, with the skilful and determined seekers of booty. Disillusioned he looks over his half century of public life and "can hardly realize that the America which I knew and believed in as a young man in the twenties could have changed so completely in so short a time."

Even when he knew the reason for the change it was hard for him, he admits, to accept it as a reality. "I saw the government of the United States enter into a struggle with the trusts, the railroads, and the banks, and I watched while the business forces won the contest. I saw the forms of republican government decay through disuse, and I saw them betrayed by the very men who were sworn to preserve and uphold them. I saw the empire of business, with its innumerable ramifications, grow up around and above the structure of government." From these premises derives his motive for writing. "The common people of the United States, as in every other country, mean well, but they are ill informed. Floundering about in their ignorance, they are tricked and robbed by those who have the inside information and therefore know how to take advantage of every turn in the wheel of fortune. . . . It is my ambition to tell my fellow-countrymen what has happened during the half century that I have known public life. I want to do this because I believe that my country is in danger . . . that the liberties of the American people are already well-nigh destroyed, that we are moving forward to a crisis of immense significance to the future of the American people, and the ideas and ideals for which the United States has stood before the world. We are far along on the road to empire, and we are traveling faster toward that goal than any nation in history ever traveled."

The following citations further illustrate the writer's perceptions—but it should be remembered that they are fully buttressed by concrete instances of every sort:

"The whole trend of legislation was toward the granting of privilege. The lawyers who composed both houses of Congress were representatives of the business interests. They never asked the question: 'What does the public welfare demand?'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Therefore their actions were always directed toward the protection of property and never toward the protection of the workers. . . . Labor has no standing in Congress. Its acknowledged leaders in conjunction with the masters of industry and finance—tie labor hand and foot. The American Federation of Labor has been in existence forty years. During the period of its power the position of the American worker has become on the whole, less, rather than more, advantageous. The big rewards, the great winnings, have gone to the owners, while the workers have received only the crumbs. . . . All our legislation has been aimed to increase the power and promote the interests of those who have as against those who produce. . . . The lawyers are not experts in government but in debauching and corrupting and crippling the government in the interest of those who pay them their fees. . . . During twelve years in the Senate . . . these lawyers . . . never hesitated to take a fee from any interests that wished to employ them. They satisfied their conscience by assuring themselves and their friends that no matter what the size of the fee, it did not influence their action as lawmakers. . . . I do not see how it would be possible to exaggerate their utter fealty to business and their supreme failure to do anything or even think anything that was in the public interest. . . . Statesmen and scholars are rare in the Senate and when, by accident, one does get there, he is treated like a pariah. He is 'not their kind'."

"In these descriptions of the relation between business and government . . . I have not tried to draw any sharp distinctions between the Republican and the Democratic parties. Indeed such an effort would be quite futile, since no real distinction exists. Historically the two parties represent varying points of view as the best method of robbing the workers. . . . Today Republicans and Democrats are alike the spokesmen of big business."

Both "Shall It Be Again?" and "Imperial Washington" are books that everyone interested in the future of this country should read. They are neither measured nor judicious in tone. They are philippics, and they ring passionately with the yearning for justice and the sincerity of conviction. They challenge overwhelming public opinion, deeply radicated concepts, and the intrenched power of organized privilege. They are contributions in our day to mankind's age-long fight for freedom —the offerings of men whose vision for the ideal is steadfast, Americans in whom lies the hope of an America true to her best self.

ERNEST H. GRUENING

The English Constitution

How England Is Governed. By Rt. Hon. C. F. G. Masterman. Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

AS a member of various English civic organizations, of Parliament and of the Cabinet, and as an official in the Local Government Board (now the Ministry of Health), the Home Office, and the Treasury, Mr. Masterman has enjoyed exceptional opportunities for learning at first hand how England is governed, both nationally and locally. A notable feature of his book is the proportion of space—nearly one-half of the total—which he devotes to local government. He has seen the political machine from outside and from inside: "from outside, as a critic of the Central Authority from amongst the local municipal authorities, or as an independent Private Member of the House of Commons challenging the Administration; from inside, as part of that Central Authority replying to the local criticism, or as a member of the government defying or placating the attacks of the Private Member." Personal experience is his principal source of information, and he knows how to draw upon it effectively to brighten his exposition.

It is neither a comprehensive treatise on English government that he gives us nor, on the other hand, such a bald summary as is to be found in English school textbooks of civics. Like Bagehot and Sidney Low he undertakes to describe, in its salient characteristics, the English political system as it works in practice. If he falls short of these predecessors in philosophical grasp of his subject, he is not inferior to them in intimacy of acquaintance with it; if his book is not quite of the stuff of which classics are made, it will remain a vivid sketch of the English constitution in the Lloyd Georgian era. When an author is his own authority, he may properly dispense with the customary apparatus of scholarship; a bibliography or substantiating references to previous writings on English government would have been superfluous if not inappropriate in such a record of personal experience as this.

Yet in spite of this experience—and for this he is to be commended—Mr. Masterman does not write from the point of view of the parliamentary politician or the administrator. He treats the government of England as a collective enterprise of the people of England, shows how the citizen chooses his rulers, local and national, and how and why he pays taxes. If he gives evidence that he is not unfamiliar with the wiles of practical politics, if he has himself played the political game, his tone, though sometimes ironical, is never cynical. He knows and shows what criticisms may be made of the "almost farcical drip of parliamentary debate," yet he has faith in the future of parliamentary institutions.

Those who condemn democracy for failure to realize its ideals are enjoined to be patient. "Today the experiment is being attempted, for the first time, of establishing a community in which each man and woman is a citizen and every man and woman free. Those who criticize the first results of so amazing an enterprise may be urged to a little patience. The time has been so short, the issues so confused, the inheritance of bad things or dead things from the past so hard to remove, that it is difficult even now to realize that the new start has begun. . . . More and more will the rulers of men find themselves responsible to a community which will be indifferent to fine phrases, birth or wealth, assertion of power, or anything but the revelation of honest service for the communal welfare." The author's purpose in writing was in no wise controversial, but those who make it their business to denounce Parliament root and branch and predict its speedy extinction might sense just a breath of defiance in this sentence: "No man ever set himself to break Parliament but Parliament broke him in the end."

Mr. Masterman is guilty of some errors. To conclude from the Parliament Act that the House of Commons "could introduce a bill that it should sit forever, and if passed three sessions running the bill would become law, even if opposed each time by the House of Lords" (p. 217) indicates that the author has not recently reread the text of that statute, which expressly withholds from the Commons the power to extend the duration of Parliament beyond the statutory period without the consent of the Lords. Nor is it correct to say that the House of Lords *must* pass money bills sent up by the House of Commons (p. 252). The Parliament Act does not coerce the Peers; it provides that money bills passed by the Commons shall become law even though they do not assent to them. It was not the Petition of Right but the Act of Settlement that first gave permanence of tenure to the judges (p. 185). It was not Gladstone's Reform Act of 1884 but Disraeli's of 1867 that first admitted lodgers to the parliamentary franchise (p. 56).

It is fortunate that the author's references to American institutions and customs are infrequent, for they are usually wrong. The President of the United States is not chosen by direct election of the voters; more than once in American history the working of our electoral system has resulted in the election of a candidate who would have been defeated if Mr. Masterman's statement (p. 77) were true. The impeachment of the President does not require "overwhelming majorities of the Elected Chambers" (p. 215). Nor is it true that in America "all attend the common school" (p. 117). Attention is called to these errors not in a spirit of pettifogging pedan-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try, but to caution the reader that not even a gentleman who has held high public offices is necessarily infallible when he writes on matters of government.

Mr. Masterman is concerned throughout with the actual working of English government, the facts of constitutional practice, but he occasionally allows himself to be imposed upon by the "literary theory" of the English constitution. A striking example of this is his statement (p. 227) that it is the function of the House of Commons to control expenditure. This generalization is followed by an excellent and vivid description of the actual process of expenditure which reveals the House in the role of impotent spectator. The reason why the estimates fail to receive any competent parliamentary criticism, we are told, is because the House of Commons has little time in which to examine them, because such time as it does give to them is devoted to "the examination of grievances, instead of the hunt for extravagance," and because a vote against an estimate would be regarded as a vote of want of confidence in the government. Immediately after the war, following the publication of reports by a committee on national expenditure, an effort was made to give the House some genuine control of appropriation by referring estimates to small committees. The results, however, failed to justify the hopes of those responsible for the new procedure. "The only spark of public interest which such a system provoked in the year of its trial in 1919 was when the members of one of these committees, after heated discussion, refused expenditure for the Lord Chancellor's bath. And the interest here was less in the campaign of economy than in the nature of the subject economized—whether or no extra facilities should be provided in his new residence for the ablutions of Lord Birkenhead. The bath was restored to him by the House on the report stage without discussion, and with such restoration the new system perished." The author is probably justified in his opinion that the House of Commons could secure control of appropriation only if the estimates were examined by its representatives before they were finally approved and published by the government. But why, then, repeat an inherited maxim against which the facts protest?

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER

Indoor Sports for Intellects

The Critical Game. By John Macy. Boni and Liveright. $2.50.

"THE function of criticism at the present time, and at all times, is the function of all literature, to be wise, witty, eloquent, instructive, humorous, original, graceful, beautiful, provocative, irritating, persuasive." Criticism, says Mr. Macy further, is a sport out of which a man may get a good deal of fun. That is what Mr. Macy does, leaving to other critics of other dispositions the apocalyptic processes of their art. He believes that criticism is important, and that it is more or less effectual; but he insists upon remembering that the pleasures of literature are not all for the reader. Any good writer enjoys writing. Even a solemn writer may enjoy his solemnity. There is danger, however, that the knit brow and the glowering eye may mean that he who resorts to them has taken up a posture. Now postures in criticism—as in every kind of literature—Mr. Macy does not like. He suspects that persons who strike them are laboring to be or seem rather more than they actually are. And he believes that if it is the critic's business to find the essential character of the author he is examining, so is it his business to let it be quite clear what sort of character he has himself.

In this book of slight essays gathered from many sources Mr. Macy has not, so far as I can see, struck anything remotely like a pose. He remains steadily himself in the presence of Dante, Nietzsche, Tolstoi, Maeterlinck, Conrad, Strindberg, Tagore, Gourmont, Swift, William James, Poe, George E. Woodberry, Abraham Cahan, Hardy, Borrow, Shelley, Wells, Masefield, Shakespeare, George Moore, James Joyce, and D. H. Lawrence. His range is wide, his information sound, his gusto generous. He does not go beyond his depth, because he knows what his depth is. He gives, for instance, his explanation of Swift's attitude toward women merely for what it is worth. I do not feel sure it is worth much, for the explanation to me seems rather sketchy; but I do not know any better explanation, and this one has the merit of being full of shrewd observations about love and pride which are worth carrying away for their own sake. In his discussion of Dante's political philosophy Mr. Macy practically confines himself to its bearings upon the idea of universal peace, because that idea particularly interests him. Everywhere, indeed, he has the courage to pass over topics which do not touch him closely. Consorting with masterpieces he picks out the aspects of them which rouse his thought, stir his emotions, please his senses, studies these aspects till he understands just how they have struck him, and then puts his feelings about them into words which are as accurate and direct as he can make them. He is one of the most intelligent and most intelligible of recent critics.

For the most part he is cool, detached, speaking in a low tone. At the same time he knows how to pour poison and how to sound a horn. Tagore, that windy, sighing fakir, has rarely had the justice meted out to him that Mr. Macy metes out. He might, and I think should, have pointed more emphatically at the essential emptiness of Maeterlinck. But Mr. Macy seems not to get his best fun out of flaying. He rarely takes the trouble to write about authors whom he does not, in some fashion, admire. I suspect that he will set a great many of his readers to reading—or re-reading—the books discussed in "The Critical Game." I know that I, who am a hardened reader of critical appreciations, found myself making hot resolves to get on with a volume on Whitman which I have agreed to write but which I have kept postponing, and found myself ardently planning a volume on Tolstoi which I had never thought of before. I bear this testimony because I think it tells something about the quality of Mr. Macy's book. He is simple and sincere in a way which makes him contagious out of all proportion to his apparent effort. For this reason he seems to me to be a critic who has done more than play with his criticism: he has lived it.

CARL VAN DOREN

The Nation's Poetry Prize

THE NATION offers an annual poetry prize of $100 for the best poem submitted by an American poet in a contest conducted by *The Nation* each year between Thanksgiving and New Year's Day. The rules for the contest in 1922 are as follows:

1. Each manuscript submitted in the contest must reach the office of *The Nation*, 20 Vesey Street, New York City, not earlier than Friday, December 1, and not later than Saturday, December 30, plainly marked on the outside of the envelope, "For *The Nation's* Poetry Prize."

2. Manuscripts must be typewritten and must have the name of the author in full on each page of the manuscript submitted.

3. As no manuscripts submitted in this contest will in any circumstances be returned to the author it is unnecessary to inclose return postage. An acknowledgment of the receipt of each manuscript, however, will be sent from this office.

4. No more than three poems from the same author will be admitted to the contest.

5. No restriction is placed upon the subject or form of poems submitted, which may be in any meter or in free verse. It will be impossible, however, to consider poems which are more than 400 lines in length, or which are translations, or which are in any language other than English. Poems arranged in a definite sequence may, if the author so desires, be counted as a single poem.

6. The winning poem will be published in the Midwinter

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literary Supplement of *The Nation*, to appear February 14, 1923.

7. Besides the winning poem, *The Nation* reserves the right to purchase at its usual rates any other poem submitted in the contest.

The judges of the contest are the editors of *The Nation*. Poems should in no case be sent to them personally.

Music

A Newspaper Critic

MR. PARKER, critic of music and drama for the Boston *Evening Transcript* over the signature H. T. P., has been these many years a voluminous writer in the columns of his newspaper on his appointed subjects. This book of "Eighth Notes"* consists almost entirely of critical nuggets taken from his daily *Transcript* reviews. As Mr. Parker himself so modestly puts it in his preface, the book is not a collection of comprehensive and searching critical studies, but is made up of the "impressions received and recorded by a reviewer for a newspaper in the daily round of concert hall, opera house, and 'copy.'"

Lest these nuggets "strewn through the columns" of the *Transcript* should seem desultory and unrelated, they have been "astutely assembled and ingeniously coordinated" by a friend of the author. The result is a series of brief appreciations grouped under such heads as "Conductors," "Singing-actors," "Singers of Songs," "Pianists," "Violinists," "Dancers," etc., disclosing opinions entertained by the author concerning prominent musicians and dancers—Toscanini, Muck, Mengelberg, Monteux, Garden, Farrar, Jeritza, Fremstad, McCormack, Rosing, Culp, Paderewski, Kreisler, Heifetz, Pavlowa, Duncan, and many others.

The book so composed is interesting and suggestive to living readers who care about how music is performed and interpreted —for even the dancers that Mr. Parker singles out are more or less "interpreters" of music. It is suggestive primarily because it cannot but challenge the reader to agreement and disagreement. He will nod his head with pleasure when Mr. Parker in happy phrase voices one of his own pet hates or loves. But when he and Mr. Parker differ, his fingers may crisp and tingle at the alluring thought of making somebody's fine fur fly.

And here for the fellow-reviewer there enters a second suggestiveness—our duty not to our living readers, but to our infinitely tender ward the future! Not that one flatters oneself that the future will spend a great deal of its time poring over the quotidian journalism of the past. But the few, the students and the faddists who for one reason or another do endeavor to reach a just appraisal of the musical performance of a vanished epoch, have no choice but to study the contemporary accounts, though our tender ward the future will be vastly assisted in such research by the practical modern development of the so-called talking machine. When, however, the future, to supplement and in a measure to explain that valuable aid, does turn to the reviewers of the past, inevitably it will do as we of today do, pin its faith to those of them who write the most seductively. Most of us who now venture to comment on singing are, for instance, nurtured on that Chorley who wrote of the singers of those "palmy days" of the great Italian bel canto which now have all the glamor of a golden legend. From Chorley's accounts we have mainly formed our notions of Alboni and of Jenny Lind, of Pasta, Grisi, Rubini, Lablache, Pauline Viardot, and a dozen others. Why? Because Chorley could write vividly and communicatively. Obviously he was prejudiced against Jenny Lind, and yet so far as the voice and singing of the "Swedish Nightingale" survive for us today, it is in the pages of Chorley, because Chorley could write.

Some of us have read likewise the musical feuilletons of Théophile Gautier and read them delighted and persuaded simply because the author of "Mademoiselle de Maupin" and the "Emaux et Camées" possessed an intelligence sensitive to the world of sound as to the world of sight, although rumor has it that in reality he knew nothing about music. So much for the testimony of the past. But who of the future is going to collate and compare all the contemporary accounts of the goings on at New York's Metropolitan Opera House in the year of grace 1922, cheerfully hoping through his long labor to arrive at a conclusion of some sort or other? For, after all the labor, the conclusion would probably be quite inaccurate anyhow, if one can admit much of "accuracy" in anything so largely personal as the impressions gathered hurriedly at the opera or the concert of the day. And, besides, many men have many ears.

The writer of these words might object emphatically to Mr. Parker's nugget comparing those eminent dispensers of florid song, Mmes. Tetrazzini and Galli-Curci. There is scarcely a hint that the former is vocally anything more than a singing machine, and not a word for the superlative comedy of her Annetta, the poor cobbler's wife, in "Crispino e la Comare." Of Mme. Galli-Curci Mr. Parker writes as though she were Adelina Patti and the Alhambra combined—"arabesque above some Moorish doorway in the ruins of Granada when bright Spanish sun shines through them. . . . The perfect voice of coloratura singing as the expressive means for which imaginative composers employ it." And in all the rhapsodizing over this pleasing little singer, there is never a word of her peculiar aptitude for singing flat. However, that tour de force of omission is rather a relief; other reviewers have dwelt on it so persistently. The late James Huneker one day remarked in desperation that for his own part he should never mention the subject again.

One may wonder at Mr. Parker's characterizing Pierre Monteux as the "ablest of the Parisian conductors," and Messrs. Messager, Chevillard, Pierné, and Rühlmann would wonder too, and also M. Rhené-Baton, to say nothing of M. Henri Rabaud, whom Mr. Parker strangely dismisses as a mere "stop gap" in the series of Boston Symphony conductors. It seems passing strange to define Willem Mengelberg as a "conductor in terms of melodrama" and a curious lapse to refer to Eugène Ysaye as relatively at the beginning of his career as a conductor by profession. One fears the king of fiddlers when he drops the bow to take up the baton cannot claim the excuse of a novitiate for any shortcomings he may bewray; he was assistant conductor of Bilse's orchestra in Berlin in 1880 and he organized his symphonic "Concerts Ysaye" in Brussels in 1894! One regrets that Mr. Parker bows to current New York cant so far as to begin his appreciation of Mary Garden by granting apologetically the "twenty technical faults" of the lady's singing—twenty that are mainly mythical—and that his appraisal of her Fiora and her Monna Vanna also bear warping signs of the orthodox New York tradition. His praise of Julia Culp is excessive, as the years have shown. He ignores the mystic quality in Olive Fremstad, who is intelligent but not cerebral. His tribute to Maria Jeritza is like nothing but G. B. S. in the throes of private correspondence with Mrs. Patrick Campbell: "In herself she is the singing actress fused, welded, rounded. Molten is the illusion." None in the Manhattan fellowship of busy boosters has quite risen to that last quip.

So much for the flying of the fur. Then one curls gratefully up and purrs with the satisfaction of knowing that our tender ward the future can read such fine and just appreciations as these that follow. Of Olive Fremstad as Brünnhilde: "Once and again the still magnificence of her repose seemed to fill the stage." Of Karl Muck: "Surely it is safe to say that no living conductor has assembled in himself more of the attributes of a great conductor or held them in juster balance than Dr. Muck." Of Emmy Destinn: "Violin-like." Of the Flonzaley Quartet: "Righteous." A further satisfaction is the discerning tribute to the art of that remarkable Russian singer Vladimir Rosing. And if in a few words one would summon Isadora Duncan as she used to be in the more vernal years, what

* *Eighth Notes.* By H. T. Parker. Dodd, Mead and Company. $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could do it better than these two sentences? "On occasion Miss Duncan believed she danced to Beethoven. Almost always she was dancing to Mozart."

But this little commentary, after all, is at best an impression of the work of an impressionist. Who is anyone that he should sit in solemn judgment on another's opinions as to a matter so personal as the appraisal of music, acting, the dance? Mr. Parker's friend has in any case assembled and arranged a readable and suggestive book for the many who care for its subjects today and for our tender ward the future.

PITTS SANBORN

Drama

Mid-Season Plays

THE fantastic has ruled in the upper reaches of the theatrical atmosphere. Deep and fine art has been represented by "Loyalties," "Rain," Mr. Barrymore's "Hamlet," and should have been by "Rose Bernd." In somewhat lower regions the air has been more uniformly clear and tonic. After a long course of Mr. A. A. Milne's exercises in what the general takes for caviare, culminating in the ecstatic silliness of "The Romantic Age" (Comedy Theater), the Theater Guild has at last brought us the one quite serious and quite soundly wrought play that he ever wrote. In the Introduction to his "First Plays" Mr. Milne said: "'The Lucky One' was doomed with a name like that from the start. And the girl marries the wrong man. But if any critic wishes to endear himself to me, he will agree with me that it is the best play of the five." No critic need desire to endear himself to Mr. Milne for having so obvious a perception. "The Lucky One" is simply in a different world from all the other plays of Mr. Milne. It analyzes a moral problem in strictly dramatic terms with both delicacy of touch and weightiness of intention. It takes a motive that life and the human mind has conventionalized for ages—even in the old folk and fairy tales—and makes it fresh and new and, in the highest sense, instructive. Plainness is not necessarily virtue nor honest mediocrity health of spirit; brilliancy and good fortune are not necessarily accompanied by either ease or selfishness and the blandest exterior may hide the more stricken heart. The Guild production is beautiful and intelligent. Mr. Dennis King, Mr. Percy Waram, Miss Violet Heming, and Miss Helen Westley play with a precision, an excellence of modulation, an identification of themselves with the inner life of the play, which it is only fair to attribute, in part at least, to the direction of Theodore Komisarjevsky.

"Hospitality" by Leon Cunningham (Forty-eighth Street Theater), the second production of the Equity Players, is of genuine importance. It is the first play of a young American dramatist; it is immensely sincere and searching. It breaks down in a muddled last act. But the quality of that last act is due to no temporizing but to the author's ignorance of the fact that stories have no ending, that the stream of reality has no completeness at any point, that a moment's peace and the foreshadowing of future conflict is the only issue to a play that can convince the disciplined imagination. The substance and body of "Hospitality" is in a broad and deep study of an American character, of a woman who has sacrificed, whom life has forced to sacrifice, kindness to duty, grace to toil, sweetness to hard practicality. Had the ending of the story been a little more relentless, the study of impoverishment by the harsh uses of this particular world would have been of extraordinary force. Even so it has a vigor and impressiveness heightened throughout by the superb playing of Louise Closser Hale.

Miss Zoe Akins, who has been busy obscuring her real self in a series of plays from "Déclassée" on, returns to it in "The Texas Nightingale" (Empire Theater). The fable is mere claptrap. But the comic spirit in the piece is really creative. The Texas Nightingale herself is a rich, ironic study in moral contrasts; she is an American provincial who combines the manners of the great world of art with the maxims of her home town. Brilliantly good is the study of her son Raymond, the uncannily intelligent young poet of the moment. And these two parts are played with gay exactness and understanding by Jobyna Howland and Percy Helton. One can dismiss the plot and even avoid the ending and welcome back one of the few civilized minds among us who use the medium of the stage.

I have hesitated to speak of Mr. Channing Pollock's "The Fool" (Times Square Theater). Its spirit is so fine, its intentions so honorable to the author, that it seems difficult to characterize it as a work of art. An American playwright who forces upon the boards of a commercial theater a piece in which the labor spy system is recognized and stigmatized, deserves the heartiest recognition for his courage and for the honor of his mind. It is a pity that the only dramaturgic methods at his command were those of sentimental comedy at almost its softest and grossest. He will reach a great crowd that needs reaching on just these subjects and from that point of view one may be reconciled to a powerful popular sermon instead of a good play.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

TRAVEL in EUROPE Moderate Cost
Short Tours and Long Tours. Tours for Special Study
Itineraries and Estimates for Individuals
Steamer Reservations
WAYFARERS TRAVEL AGENCY
45 WEST 34th STREET, NEW YORK Also London and Paris

LECTURES and AMUSEMENTS

SCOTT NEARING
HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS
Can Every Man Earn a Living Under Capitalism?
Sunday Afternoon, December 10, 2:30 P.M.
Brooklyn Academy of Music
Tickets 50c to $2
Rand School 7 E. 15th St.

Are you a member of the THEATRE GUILD?
There are no membership dues. Privileges include:
1. Theatre tickets to Guild productions at reduced rates.
2. A special production for members only.
3. Lectures by members of the Guild staff, free.
Blanks and Information may be had on application to Subscription Secretary
The THEATRE GUILD, 35th Street between 5th and 6th Avenues
or by telephone Fitzroy 2227

JOLSON'S 59th ST. THEATRE At Seventh Ave., Eve., 8:30 Matinees—Thurs. and Sat., 2:30
WM. A. BRADY Offers
THE WORLD WE LIVE IN (The Insect Play)
"Most novel play of the season."—*Darnton, Eve. World.*
"Magnificently Effective."—*Heywood Broun, World.*

RAND SCHOOL
7 East 15th Street
Tuesdays, 8:40 P.M...Herman Epstein "Ring of the Nibelungen"
Thursdays, 8:40 P.M....Waldo Frank "Literature and Art"
Saturdays, 1:30 P.M....Scott Nearing "Current Events"
December 9th, 11 A.M....Angelo Patri
8:15 P.M...Harry Dana "Current Plays"
Sundays, 8:15 P.M.—FORUM—Dec. 10—STUART CHASE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Moscow and the Far Eastern Republic

THE joining of Soviet Russia by the Far Eastern Republic was no surprise in Moscow. It was effected by the mutual consent of both parties concerned as a matter of course. The opinion of the Moscow authorities was expressed in the leading article printed in the Moscow *Izvestia* of October 29, before the formal announcement of the change. It is here reproduced in part.

The Far East Should Become Soviet

The Far Eastern Republic owes it to the energy of her laboring population, to the heroism of the people's revolutionary army, and the fraternal assistance of Soviet Russia that she regained her natural boundaries. At present almost all of her provinces, excepting the northern part of Sakhalin, are united. . . . What kind of political order should the Far Eastern Republic adopt now? Will she remain a democratic republic formally or will she be proclaimed a soviet republic? Will she maintain the old form of bourgeois democracy or will she join politically the soviet federation to which she is bound by common fate and by the political sympathies of her population?

We suppose that the time has come to speak out the facts as they are and openly to declare the Far Eastern Republic a soviet republic. The Far Eastern Republic had been declared a democratic republic owing to the pressure of foreign imperialism, particularly under the pressure of the Japanese who directly demanded that the Far Eastern Republic be acknowledged not a soviet but a democratic republic. This was conceded in the interests of peace, in the hope of weakening by this act the foreign intervention and the onslaught of international capital, particularly of Japanese imperialism against this distant frontier of Soviet Russia. Even then all the sympathies of the overwhelming majority of the population of the Far Eastern Republic were in favor of the soviet form of government. Not only the workers, not only the partisans (the detachments waging a guerrilla war against the white guards), but the masses of the peasantry were anxious to proclaim the Far Eastern Republic a soviet republic and even to join openly the RSFSR. The tendency toward a reunion with Soviet Russia was so strong, the soviet sympathies of the toiling population of the Far Eastern Republic were so profound, that even the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries did not at that time dare to argue against introducing the soviet form of government. And the task fell upon us, Communists, who had to bear the political responsibility for the fate of the liberated Far Eastern territory and who were anxious to save this territory and the Russian state from more conflicts and international complications—it was our task to convince the broad masses that it was expedient to introduce the bourgeois democratic form of government for the time being. The Far Eastern buffer state was created as a wall which served to weaken the onslaughts of the foreign enemy; it served as an artificially constructed dam under cover of which we might reorganize and gather forces for the further defense.

In reality it turned out that this forced concession has not fully justified the hopes which had been placed in it. The onslaught of the enemy became somewhat less, perhaps, but it was not removed completely. The intervention did not stop. Japan did everything possible in order to get hold of this province, or at least to subjugate it to her hirelings whom she had found in the persons of white-guard bands. And it was necessary to wage a cruel war for three years in order to rout these bands supported by the Japanese army of occupation and to force the Japanese interventionists to quit the province.

Will the international political position of the Far Eastern Republic and of the RSFSR become worse when the FER is proclaimed a soviet republic? We don't think so. As far as the chief intervening power—Japan—is concerned, she attached very little importance to the form of government which had been forced by her upon the FER. Japan repeatedly tried to justify her intervention by claiming that the FER was a bolshevik soviet republic in fact and that she constituted a part of Soviet Russia. And lately it was recognized both on the part of Japan and on our part that the negotiations between Japan and the Far Eastern Republic could not be separated from the negotiation with Soviet Russia, that peace with the former was unthinkable without peace with the latter. The recent negotiations at Chang-chung were conducted on this very basis. . . .

The question is what will be the attitude of the population of the Far aEstern Republic . . .? The whole past of the Far Eastern Republic has demonstrated that this [a soviet republic] is exactly what the population desires. Only among the bourgeois groups such an act might create a certain hidden opposition. . . . But all the workers, soldiers in the people's army, and peasants of the Far Eastern Republic will hail with enthusiasm her proclamation as a soviet republic. They have never considered themselves other than soviet citizens, and they will gladly accept a formal political reunion with their brothers of great Russia. And even many of the bourgeois elements who remained in the Maritime Province and, together with the rest of the population, met the troops of the people's revolutionary army with flowers and tears of joy, will prefer the soviet government to the rule of the Japanese and the white-guard bands which were the agents of Japanese expansion.

This is why we think that just now it would be timely to complete the victory gained by the population of the Far East by a solemn and open proclamation of the FER as a soviet republic with all the consequences of such an act. . . .

The Reunion of the Far Eastern Republic with Soviet Russia

The following dispatch was printed in the Moscow *Izvestia* of November 15:

CHITA, November 14.—Today the second session of the People's Assembly took place. . . . During the session delegates of workers and of the army appeared in the hall. After being granted the floor they made public a resolution demanding the immediate dissolution of the People's Assembly, and of the government of the Far Eastern Republic, the union of the Far Eastern Republic with Soviet Russia, and the introduction of the government of the soviets in the Far East.

In view of the fact that from all cities and villages of the Far Eastern Republic similar demands have been made upon the People's Assembly, and in almost all of the provinces of the Republic local soviets and revolutionary committees have already been created, the People's Assembly agreed to discuss the situation of the republic and the demands of the toiling population. Before the subject of the status of the FER was discussed the representatives of all party groups in the People's Assembly declared themselves in favor of introducing the soviet form of government in the Far East and of uniting with the RSFSR.

After the discussion the People's Assembly adopted unanimously a resolution to dissolve, to join Russia, to introduce the soviet form of government, and to create the Ear Eastern Revolutionary Committee. After this decision had been adopted, the People's Assembly created a Revolutionary Committee of seven members and elected fifteen delegates to the Tenth All-Russian Congress of the Soviets [to be held in Moscow December 20]. After a short appeal by the new Far Eastern Revolutionary Committee to the People's Assembly, the session of the latter was adjourned forever.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STILL IN JAIL

Seven Little Sparrows

Beyond the deep-cut window
The bars are heaped with snow
And seven little sparrows
Are sitting in a row.

Fluffy blur of snowflakes;
Dappled haze of light;
The narrow prison vista
Is all awhirl with white.

Seven little sparrows
Ruffled brown and grey
Snuggled close against the bars—
And this is Christmas day!

By Ralph Chaplin

Ralph Chaplin and 58 of his fellow agitators for industrial justice are behind Federal prison bars because they dared to tell the truth about the war while the war was in progress. Chaplin has spent five consecutive Christmases behind the bars, yet he can write:

To Freedom

Out on the "lookout" in the wind and sleet,
Out in the woods of fir and spruce and pine,
Down in the hot slopes of the dripping mine
We dreamed of you and Oh, the dream was sweet!
And now you bless the felon food we eat
And make each iron cell a sacred shrine;
For when your love thrills in the blood like wine,
The very stones grow holy to our feet.

We shall be faithful though we march with Death
And singing storm the barricades of Wrong,
For life is such a little thing to give.
We shall fight on as long as we have breath—
Love in our hearts and on our lips a song—
Without you it were better not to live!

These are two of the poems from his famous book **"Bars and Shadows"** — an ideal Christmas reminder, and one of the most effective documents for amnesty that has appeared.

DEMAND THE RELEASE OF ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS

Do Ralph Chaplin a good turn by ordering six copies of "Bars and Shadows" and using them for holiday gifts. The book is privately published. Every penny above the actual cost of manufacture, advertising and distribution goes to Mrs. Chaplin and her son. The book is one dollar, postpaid (six copies for five dollars; fifteen copies for ten dollars.) It may be secured by addressing Mrs. Edith Chaplin, 7 E. 15th Street, New York City.

Mourn Not the Dead

Mourn not the dead that in the cool earth lie—
Dust unto dust—
The calm, sweet earth that mothers all who die
As all men must;

Mourn not your captive comrades who must dwell—
Too strong to strive—
Within each steel-bound coffin of a cell,
Buried alive;

But rather mourn the apathetic throng—
The cowed and the meek—
Who see the world's great anguish and its wrong
And dare not speak!

from
"BARS AND SHADOWS"
by Ralph Chaplin

M I L K

For the CHILDREN *of* Saxony and Thuringia

Certain districts of Saxony and Thuringia which even before the war counted among the poorest of otherwise prosperous Germany are suffering to an almost unbelievable degree from the privations which the war has brought upon them.

Statistical figures recently received from 100 towns and villages show 95 per cent undernourishment and 41 per cent tuberculosis.

Prof. Rudolf Eucken, the world-famous scientist, writes: "While most other foodstuffs can be bought in Germany, milk is not only prohibitive in price but practically unobtainable. . . . Money is still the most welcome gift with but one exception, MILK. . . . Your shipments of MILK have saved many a child."

We, therefore, appeal to the generosity of the *Nation* readers to send us their contributions toward our MILK FUND. You will enjoy the whipped cream on your Xmas cake much better if you know that your donation supplied a few German babies with milk.

DR. CARL G. GROSSMANN

Dr. Richard E. Salter, Secty.,
Relief Committee for Saxony and Thuringia,
115 Broadway (Room 401),
New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

The enclosed $..... is sent to you with the distinct understanding that it be used for milk exclusively.

Very truly yours,

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Parting Words of the Japanese

BEFORE leaving Vladivostok the commander-in-chief of the Japanese troops, Tachibana, addressed the following telegram to the commander-in-chief of the troops of the Far Eastern Republic, Uborevich:

To His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief of the Chita Army, Uborevich. Unfortunately I had to meet you under arms, and I was very sorry, but thanks to your highly just and well-timed orders we succeeded in avoiding hostilities and parted as friends, which I consider very fortunate for both states and armies. This will be a pledge for future friendly relations which are bound to be initiated in the nearest future. With this I wish you all good fortune. October 25, Vladivostok. Commander-in-Chief of the Japanese troops, General Tachibana.

A Jewish Manifesto to the Arabs

THE Jewish National Council of Palestine has issued a second manifesto to the Arabs, the text of which follows in its original translated form.

To subjects of the dear and holy motherland, Palestine, and to all the Arabic nations in their respective countries. We, all the members of the Jewish nationality dwelling with you in our country, come to you, our Arabic brethren, with a message of peace and love, of unity and joint labors, to lay before you the sincerity of our aims and the purity of our hopes. You must know that our Bible and the writings of the Prophets admonish us never to transgress the laws of justice and fairness. Ere yet our feet had trod this holy land, we had engraved deep in our hearts that we were coming to reinhabit the sandy shores and the deserts of this land; to fructify the mountains and the valleys; to bring to light the treasures embedded deep in the strata; to elevate the waters falling at present to waste and creating the swamps which bring sickness on the dwellers of low-lying parts; to conquer by toil and sweat, by money and science that which the inhabitants of the land were unable previously to exploit through lack of means; to bring a sheaf of blessing on all the toilers in this land; and above everything, not to encroach on anybody's rights and privileges.

We come not to dominate you, as our traducers allege against us, nor yet to encroach on your own perfect and sacred rights. Our prophets, with heavenly inspiration, did exhort us to give rights of possession in our midst even to strangers sojourning with us; how then shall we debase our thoughts by having intention to exploit a whole nation, our very kindred, with whom we are dwelling in the one country?

Enlightened Palestine subjects, open your eyes and behold what exists; let our deeds bear witness for us; we have been dwelling in the land from early times and it is now quite forty years that we have been building villages here; have we then molested any person during all this time? or did it even enter the minds of any of us to injure any one? We have brought in from abroad millions of francs and expended them in the country for the benefit and welfare of all the inhabitants. Wastes and deserted places which no one ever dreamed of settling on were transformed by us into habitable towns; the places where now flourish our colonies have created fresh sources of livelihood for thousands of the inhabitants, have raised the values of landed property and produce, and have revitalized the life and movement of the neighborhoods. Consider the town of Tel-Aviv; scarce thirteen years ago there was nought but sandy waste there and for a few pence it was even possible to obtain vast stretches of land, while now hundreds of houses and thousands of settlers have been added and the price of land for a considerable extent around has reached almost fabulous figures. . . . In order to engender misunderstandings between us and to anathematize us some people have arrogantly dared in the name of holy religion to invent libelous falsehoods, declaring that we have come here to obtain possession of your holy places so as to desecrate them.

You, the nation, can be the truest witness for the refutation of so baseless an accusation. For one small moment place your hand on your heart, and, with reverent feeling ask your very soul if ever indeed a Jew had desecrated what you hold sacred. They terrify you with an alleged peril from the Halutzim (pioneers). Go and investigate whom these workmen harm. Do they not buy all their needs from the local inhabitants and pay with choice Jewish money, flooding the country from abroad? Who are the buyers of the toil of the fellah and fisherman at the principal markets of Jaffa, Jerusalem, and other cities? Is this then the way we exploit the natives? Or is it then that a Jew buys and does not pay, or that a Jew borrows and does not settle?

Pray, in what way have we encroached on your rights? Let the gentlest child relate or the most unfortunate native woman declare; or let whosoever has had dealings with Jews either in trade or at work tell whether Jews molest them or whether it is not with justice and fairness, with respect and consideration that we behave to them while working for us in house or field. The development of the country calls for a stupendous effort which only all of us together can accomplish; secure in our justice and confident in our fairness we come to call for joint labors. We are brethren in this land; let us then work together to make it bloom, and each nation will gather strength and develop its nationalistic powers, its language, and its literature; for you must surely know that in work and science competition is a blessing to the competitors and to the whole world.

By virtue of that truth which transcends and overcomes all falsehoods and libels, we are confident that all the Arabic nations will soon come to recognize that, in their aspirations for freedom and progress, they will assuredly find in the Jewish nation a brother faithful in thought and deed, a staunch and unswerving ally, and a loyal and willing comrade.

Semitic nations, our regeneration is your regeneration and our freedom is your freedom.

Kiao-chau—Open Port

THE following translation from the Chinese of the draft regulations for the administration of Kiao-chau as an open port upon its restoration by Japan is taken from the Peking *Daily News* of October 26. The *Daily News* states that the document was published in the Tsing-tao *Leader*, a Japanese weekly, and is not to be considered conclusive or final in its form.

ARTICLE I. These regulations have been drawn up after careful consideration of the rules obtaining in self (*sic*) open ports, enacted in ..... year, and the special conditions existing in Kiao-chau.

ART. II. The territory of the open port of Kiao-chau comprises the area from north latitude 35° 53′ 30″ to 36° 16′ 30″, and from east longitude 120° 8′ 30″ to 120° 35′ 30″.

ART. III. The self-governing units in Kiao-chau are divided into the city proper and outlying villages.

ART. IV. The city which comprises the district of Tsing-tao town, Ta-tung-chin and Ta-Shih-chin shall be called the city of Tsing-tao; and all other communities shall be called villages and shall be prescribed for by the governor of the open port.

ART. V. The regulations for self-government proclaimed in the 10th year, 7th month, 3rd day (July 3, 1921) shall apply to the open port of Kiao-chau with the addition of further regulations which shall be prescribed to meet the special conditions of the open port.

ART. VI. The functions of the government of the open port of Kiao-chau are as follows:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A League of Industries

THE NEXT STEP

by
SCOTT NEARING

A constructive, dynamic, far-reaching, practicable plan for economic world federation that will eliminate war and enlarge the possibilities of human well-being.

Just published at $1.00 in cloth and $.50 in paper, postpaid.

(Five cloth copies, $4; ten copies, $7. Paper at half that price.)

An Ideal Holiday Gift

NELLIE SEEDS NEARING, Publisher
RIDGEWOOD, N. J.

(Book stores supplied by PAINE BOOK CO., 75 W. Van Buren Street, Chicago)

RHYMES OF EARLY JUNGLE FOLK
An Outline of Pre-History for the Young Folks
By MARY E. MARCY
With 71 wood cuts by Wharton H. Esherick. Most charming of Christmas books; delightful stories of the Neolithic boys and girls and the animals that chased them. Action enough in these rhymes to thrill the children; science and wit enough to delight the parents.
Cloth, $2.00, by parcel post C. O. D. or at the bookstores
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY 347 East Ohio St., Chicago

Practically immediate relief of pain follows a dose of

Midol

It is equally efficacious for
HEADACHE
TOOTHACHE
NEURALGIA

—and in addition to being absolutely safe to take
—it has no undesirable after effects.

In aluminum boxes
2 sizes. At all druggists

General Drug Co.
94 N. Moore Street, New York

For Those In Prison At Christmas Time

Were you ever in prison for an idea?

Were you ever banished by "society" because you didn't agree with those who control the public thought?

Were you ever ostracized by other human beings because they didn't approve of your opinions?

For such reasons, more than 200 workingmen are now caged in various American prisons.

In Leavenworth penitentiary are numerous workers who have served more than five years because they disagreed with the powers about the motives behind the war in Europe. Because of their independent expressions, they are forced to suffer a daily monotonous routine behind the bars.

In California, 24 or more are in San Quentin and Folsom prisons because they had the audacity to question the right of private ownership of the means of life. They are serving from one to 14 years for urging their fellow workers to join the I. W. W. No overt act was ever proved nor ever charged against them.

In Walla Walla prison in Washington are the seven Centralia boys who defended their hall against a mob of superior numbers. They are serving 25 to 40 years because they really believed in the United States Constitution. Another Centralia boy is in an asylum; he was made insane by the tortures of the mob. Six jurors have confessed that they convicted the defendants only because they dared not acquit them.

And almost every Western penitentiary holds workingmen who are paying the price for believing in the rights of free speech, free press, and free assemblage. These men have fought in the front line of battle for those rights; they are holding true.

As Christmas approaches, the **General Defense Committee** is raising a fund to provide gifts of money for each man who was imprisoned for his ideas and who remains loyal to his class. An equal amount will be sent to each prisoner regardless of his affiliation.

Send your check today, and a receipt will be sent you.

The **General Defense Committee,** working from its headquarters in Chicago, and through subordinate committees elsewhere, is the only committee authorized to raise Christmas funds for the I. W. W.

Send your check today, and a receipt will go to you promptly.

General Defense Committee
1001 WEST MADISON STREET, CHICAGO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. To enact and amend by-laws and regulations for the government of the port.
2. To control and manage public properties and to construct and manage civil works.
3. The survey, registration, and expropriation of public and private land.
4. The classification and leasing of public land.
5. Harbor services and wharves.
6. The raising of taxes in the open port and the receiving of subsidies and paying contribution from and to the central government.
7. Administration and supervision of land and marine police and other police services.
8. The supervision of autonomies in the open port.
9. Anything necessary besides the above-mentioned.

ART. VII. The office of the open port.

The President shall directly appoint the Governor of the open port. The Governor shall direct and supervise the office of the open port, and appoint the officials.

ART. VIII. The office of the open port shall have four assistants who shall assist the Governor in legal matters.

ART. IX. The office of the open port shall have four private secretaries who shall have charge of important matters, under the direction of the Governor.

ART. X. The office of the open port shall have the following divisions having charge of the functions enumerated in Article VI: (1) Division of General Affairs; (2) Division of Political Affairs; (3) Division of Police; (4) Division of Harbor Service; (5) Division of Civil Engineering; (6) Division of Foreign Affairs.

ART. XI. The officials of the divisions and the public service regulation thereof shall be established by another enactment.

ART. XII. The open port of Kiao-chau shall establish marine and land police; their organization and service shall be under the common rules of the police, besides their being a special organization, the chief officer of the said police shall be appointed on the recommendation of the Governor.

ART XIII. The open port of Kiao-chau assures all persons, Chinese or foreigners, of the freedom of residence and of trade in industrial, commercial, and other lawful pursuits.

ART. XIV. The limit of lease in the open port of Kiao-chau shall be fifty years.

ART. XV. Without sanction of the office of the open port, transactions in regard to land by any person, Chinese or foreigners, shall be null and void.

ART. XVI. Before details of regulations within the open port are enacted, the Governor shall consult the central government explaining local conditions which have a bearing on them, and obtain consent thereto; and also inform the department of the central government concerned, and the provincial government.

ART. XVII. The administration and execution of executive and judicial power within the open port belongs solely to the Chinese officials. Litigation concerning foreigners belonging to countries which have treaties shall be conducted according to those treaties; however, should a foreigner apply for relief at the Chinese court, it shall be granted.

ART. XVIII. All residents in the district of the open port of Kiao-chau, both Chinese and foreigners, shall continue to pay every description of tax which has hitherto been levied. When any increase in the existing rates and taxes or any new tax is to be levied, the governor of the port shall consult the financial advisory committee, before imposing it.

ART. XIX. A financial advisory committee shall be established consisting of nine members, five of whom shall be Chinese and four foreigners. When any increase in the rates or introduction of a new tax is contemplated, as aforesaid, the committee shall be prepared to deal with the matter. The Chinese members of the financial advisory committee shall be chosen by the self-government associations of the city and villages in the district of the open port of Kiao-chau; and the members of foreign nationality shall be chosen by residents of foreign nationalities, but no nationality shall be represented by more than two members. The term of office of members of the committee shall be one year, but any member may seek reelection.

ART. XX. The administration of the open port of Kiao-chau shall establish a transfer and public works committee of six members. The mayor of the city of Tsing-tao shall be chairman of the committee, and the remaining members shall be selected byt he Governor, thre Chinese and three foreigners. The duties of the above committee shall be to supervise and execute the transfer of public works.

ART. XXI. These regulations shall be presented by the Governor of the open port of Kiao-chau together with the minister of the departments concerned to the superior authorities for approval. The President shall publish these regulations by proclamation and they shall come into force from the date of such proclamation.

ART. XXII. Any amendment in these regulations must be effected by the President of the Republic upon representation by the Governor and the ministers of all departments concerned.

POLITICS By Frank Exline
The evolution of efficient Government by the Scientific Selection of capable and dependable representatives.
Price, $2.00 Published by E. P. Dutton & Co.

The Fifth Avenue Restaurant
Under the personal management of THEODORE KEMM, Proprietor
Fifth Avenue Bldg., Madison Square, N. Y. City
Private Rooms for Luncheon Meetings
AT NIGHT SOLELY DEVOTED TO THE SERVING OF BANQUETS, AFTER-LODGE SUPPERS, BUSINESS GATHERINGS, DINNER DANCES, SMOKERS AND BEEFSTEAK DINNERS.
Reasonable Rates **Seating Capacity 1000**

A MONTH FREE
Every new annual subscription received during the rest of 1922 will be dated from January 1, 1923, and all December numbers will be sent free. Let us have your subscriber toward the new 15,000.
See *The Nation's* Christmas book-case on another page.

In the Home of THE NATION
20 Vesey Street
New York
there are a few fine offices to rent at deflated rates.
A tenant is known by the company he keeps

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED